

A
SVRREPLICA-
TION TO THE RE-
IOYNDER OF A POPISH
ADVERSARIE.

Wherein,
THE SPIRITVALL SVPREMACY
of Christ Iesus in his Church; and the Civill or Temporall
Supremacie of Emperours, Kings, and Princes within
their owne Dominions, over Persons Ecclesiasticall, &
in causes also Ecclesiasticall (as well as Civill and
Temporall) be yet further declared defended
and maintayned against him. 3

By CHRISTOPHER SIBTHORP, Knight,
one of his Majesties Iustices of his Court of
Chiefe-place in IRELAND.

Give therefore unto Cesar the things that bee Cesars, and unto God the
things that be Gods. Matth. 22. 21.

He that is not with mee (saith Christ) is against me: And he that ga-
thereth not with me scattereth. Luke 11. 23.

Imprinted at DUBLIN by the Societie of Stationers.
Anno Domini M. DC. XXVII.

07-1082



To the Reader.

I Did not thinke (courtious Reader) that I should have
beene provoked to have written any more in these mat-
ters, untill both my first Booke, & my second also (which
is my Reply) had beene first answered, & that in such sort, as in
the Postscript annexed at the end of the same my Reply is speci-
fied and declared: But, therein I perceive mine expectation is de-
ceiued, and that my Adversarie without any regard had thereun-
to hath taken his owne course, and put forth a Rejoynder, such as
he pleased to that my Reply. In which Rejoynder of his, I am al-
so sorry to see, how much he hath wronged not only Me & his Rea-
der, but the auncient Christian Emperors, and auncient Fathers
and even Christ Iesus himselfe, and all Kings and Princes ge-
nerally, in respect of their severall rights to the belonging. Where-
fore I thought it not meete or seemely for me in this case to be silent
or to desist, but likewise to proceede, and to make and publish a
Surreplication to that his Rejoynder. And this I doe the rather,
that so a third Book being added to my two former, they all three
together might serve so much the more strongly to perswade him,
and the rest of the pretended Catholickes to the truth in this
cause, for vis unita fortior, and a threefold cord is not easily bro-

To the Reader.

Lea. If by all, or any of my labours, I shall be a meane or helpe to worke their conformitie or reformation, I shall be glad of it, for it is the maine thing I seeke after: but if they hate to be reformed, and will in contempt and scorne of all admonitions live and die in their errors (which were a case most fearefull, desperate, and lamentable,) whose fault is it, or whom can they blame therein, but themselves, and their Popish teachers, by whom they are so much, and so miserably misled and abused: My Adversarie, when hee tooke upon him to answer the two Chapters in my first Booke, did not prefixe those two Chapters of mine to his answer: Neyther when he answered my Reply, did hee prefixe my Reply to his Rejoynder: And therefore also, neyther did I prefixe his answer to my Reply, nor his Rejoynder to this my Surreplication. And hercat neyther he, nor any other for him hath cause to be offended, or to take exception, in asmuch as I doe therein but follow his owne president and example, which himselfe first used, and wherein hee began unto me. The substance, neverthelesse, marrow, pith, and strength of all his Bookes, and of his Distinctions, Evasions, Objections, and Arguments therein contayned, I have beene carefull not to omitte, but to mention, and that usually, or rather evermore in his owne wordes, and to make answer unto them. But I am loath any longer to detaine you: and therefore I here leave you to the reading of that which followeth: And that which followeth, to your owne judicious, just, and equall censure: Beseeching God to guide us all unto his truth, and to keepe and establish us therein continually, after that wee once see, and know it. Amen.

A SVRREPLICA TION TO THE REIOYNDER OF A POISH ADVERSARIE.

To my Adversarie.



IR: As you throughout your *Rejoynder* addressed your speech to me, in particular: so doe I in like sort here direct my speech unto you in this worke of mine. For although I neyther purposed nor promised it, nor others, (I suppose) expected it, yet that which you have of late published against my *Reply* hath provoked me once more to set penne to paper in defence of that cause which you so much strive against in vaine. In the beginning of that your *Rejoynder*, you say, that although wee bee different in religion, yet you desire much, that wee be united in affection. This speech of yours I dislike not because it savoureth (as I conceive it) of that humanitie and charitie which is to be entertayned, and continued amongst us, notwithstanding these differences in points of religion: as also of some good affection, and inclination in you unto Gods trueth: wherein chiefly it is, that wee are to be united. For, as touching any other kindes of unitie, namely that which is in error and falscheed, I hope you desire it not because it is as *S. Augustine* rightly calleth it, *Erroris conspiratio*, a conspiracie of error against the truth. The unitie, which is joyned with divine veritie, is it which *S. Paul* calleth, *The unitie of the spirit*, and which hee would have all Christians to be evermore verie carefull to observe, saying, *Endevour to Ephes. 4. 3*

Ephes. 4. 15.

keeps the union of the spirits in the bond of peace: and hee saith againe thus: *Let us follow the truth in love, and in all things grow up into him which is the head, that is, Christ.* This truth if we did all earnestly seeke after and follow, and that in love, and in a charitable manner (as here we are required to doe) all our controversies would the better, and the sooner be ended and determined which have now so long disquieted many mens mindes, and doe so much hinder that which is indeede most requisite, namely, the good and due practise of true religion in the world. For how can any practise religion aright, before they know which is the right religion, which they are to practise, and to walke in? Or how can they know which is the right religion they are to walke in, so long as they be doubtfull of it, by reason of questions, and controversies, that doe perplexe and distract them? The first thing then, which men desirous to live good and godly lives are to seeke after, is, in the midst of all these controversies to get & obtain within themselves a resolution of a right religion; which resolution they can never certainly have or attaine unto, but by meanes of the sacred and Canonickall Scriptures, which be the onely infallible rule of all divine truth, as I have shewed in my first Booke: So that the purpose and intention of that my first Booke, as likewise of the second, which is my Reply, and of this also, was not, nor is, to have men to dwell continually and everlastingly in controversies, but cleane contrariwise to have them all ended and determined, and that as speedily as might bee, in every mans conscience by diligent searching of those holy Scriptures, and finding out thereby what is the undoubted truth in them: that men being once thus satisfied and resolved of the truth and true religion, might afterward the better, and the more freely apply themselves to the good and due practise of it in their affections, words, workes, lives and conversations, refusing all other religions of humane invention whatsoever, and the wayes thereof. But now though the truth be never so manifest and apparant, yet some there be
of

of that froward and perverse disposition, that they will not yeelde unto it, but as *Iannes and Iambres withstood Moses*, so doe these also resist the truth, being men of corrupt mindes and reprobate concerning the faith, as *S. Paul* speaketh, of which sort of men (if I could helpe it) I would not have you to be, though you be mine Adversarie, yea though you were mine utter enemy. And therefore, as to the answer which you made to the two Chapters containd in the first part of my first Booke, I replied: so to your *Rejoynder*, I have here also thought it good to make a *Surreplication*; wherein I must not omit to tell you, that as touching the second Chapter of my *Reply*, you have in your *Rejoynder* made no answer at all unto it, but it remaineth wholly and entirely unanswered, and consequently in his full force & strength against you. And as touching the first Chapter of my *Reply*, concerning the Supremacie (upon which point it seemeth that all your thoughts were wholly fixed, & imployed) although you make some kinde of answer in your *Rejoynder* unto it, and such as perchance, you and your partakers may thinke to be somewhat strong, yet it is indeede of that great debilitie, as that upon the matter, it is as good as no answer, as will appeare by the sequele: and yet have you moreover left a great part, even of that first Chapter also unanswered. Beside that you have againe in your *Rejoynder*, sundry things which were before answered in my *Reply*, and much other idle, futile, and frivolous stuffe, which I suppose you would never have inserted into your booke but for want of better matter in your cause.

For, first, what an idle exception is this, that you take to my *Reply* in that I dedicated it to the Right Honourable the Lord Deputie? Why might I not doe so? Was it not lawfull? Or was there any inconvenience, or *indecorum* in it? You say that his Lordship hath taken the Oath of Supremacie, which maketh him a direct Partie, & being a Partie, he may not also be a Iudge in the same cause. What? have you so soone forgotten what your selfe did? For when you

made your answer to the two Chapters of my first Booke, you may remember that you dedicated it, *To your dearest countrey men, the Lawyers of Ireland.* You then thought it lawfull and seemely enough for you so to dedicate it, notwithstanding that by their refusall and utter dislike to take the Oath of Supremacie, they manifestly shewed themselves to be Parties. And was this lawfull for you to doe, and was not the other as lawfull at least, or rather much more lawfull, and seemely (all things considered) for mee to doe? Nowbeit, you know also, that Bookes be not alwayes dedicated to men to make them Judges, but sometimes, and usually to the end, they should be the Patrons thereof, albeit therein also, they be not disallowed but well allowed to passe their judgement and censure upon the same. But indeede no reason had you to dislike of the dedication of that my Booke unto his Lordship, in whom your selfe doe acknowledge that there is sufficiencie to understand, wisdom to discern, and power to command. A like second exception you take for that I call the Papists of this kingdom *Pretended Catholickes*, which title (say you) they doe not acknowledge. But whether they acknowledge it or no, it must bee graunted, that whilest they call themselves *Catholickes*, when *revera* they bee not so, (as I have shewed and proved in my first Booke) they can bee no other but *Pretended Catholickes*: As likewise hee that calleth himselfe an honest man, when *revera* he is not so, is at the most, but a pretended honest man. Yet another exception you take in this, that you say, I call you *Canis festinans* and *Luscas inter cecos*: But you mistake, in both. For, (in that my epistle dedicatorie, of my *Reply*.) I did not say, that you were, *Canis festinans*, but that whilest in your Answer, you strived to make more hast, then good speede, you shewed your selfe to be, like *Canis festinans*, *cecos edens catulos*: which is a proverbiall speech, tolerable enough in the judgment of such, as be not over captious, and often and ordinarily vsed in that sort and sence, & to that purpose that I used it. Neither did

did I say definitely, & expressely of you, that you were *Lus-tus inter cecos*, but my words be these: *Regnat inter cecos Lus-tus*, which may be as well spoken of any other, as of you, vnlesse you will needs be the man, and so take and apply it, (as you doe,) to your selfe, particularly.

2. After these exceptions, you come next to the three requests, I made to him, that would take upon him to answer my first booke: in the first whereof I desired, that he would answere it, not by parts, or pease-meals, but wholly and entirely, from the beginning of it unto the end: The second was, that he would doe it, not superficialie, and sophistically, but substantially, soundly, & satisfactorily, if he could: Thirdly, I desired him to doe it, as in love, and charity, so also with an affection, only to follow Gods truth, and with all, to set his name unto it, as I had done to that booke of mine. But hereunto, you take divers exceptions, though now somewhat lately in your *Reiowder*. First you say, that these being conditions, they should have beene agreed upon by the mutuall consent of parties: and that if any advantage be given, it should be in favour of the defendant, as in matter of challenge: for the defendant appoints the weapon, time, and place; But in this challenge of mine, contrary unto law and custome, I have (say you) assumed unto my selfe, being the challenger, the proposing of such conditions as doe disadvantage the defendant. It is true, that in contracts, and bargaines betweene man and man, the conditions must be agreed upon by mutuall consent of parties, before it be, or can be a perfect contract, or a perfect bargain, howbeit conditions for all that, not onely may be, but also must be, first propounded before they can bee assented unto, or agreed upon. Again there is as well a subsequent agreement, as a precedent: As if a man propound, or offer unto you a Lease for yeares of lands, upon certaine conditions: you may choose, whether you will accept of it, or no, upon those conditions; but if though not at the first, yet afterward, you having the election, doe declare your con-

sent, and acceptance of it, by entring upon the lands, manuring them, taking the profits, is it not reason you should performe the conditions thereunto annexed? You know how to make the application. And yet neyther was I, when I made that my Booke, contracting, or bargaining with you, or with any other man in particular: For, I then neyther did, nor could possibly know before hand, who was to be the *Answerer* of it, with whom I might so contract, nor did I take upon me the person of a Challenger, as you affirme: For I knew of no duell, that was in the case. And as for my defending of Protestancie against Poperie, it no more proveth me to be a challenger, then your defending of Poperie against Protestancie, proveth you to be the challenger. Yea in the conclusion of that my first booke *Pag. 417.* it appeareth, that I was so farre from taking upon me the person, or using the words of a challenger, that cleane contrariwise, I used onely the peaceable, and friendly words, of *Desiring*, and *Requesting*. For there I desire of him, whosoever hee were, that would take upon him to answer that booke of mine, that hee would, in that his answer, be pleased to observe, and performe those three requests, or three conditions before mentioned, which I there propounded. All which were reasonable conditions, and such as (if you well consider them) were not (as you say) disadvantageable, but much advantageable rather to the cause of the answerer, if hee had performed them. But here, by the way, you tell me, of a verie compendious course, how that my whole first booke is answered and confuted: For you say, that he which sayleth in one point of faith, sayleth in all, and that a refutation or disproofe of any one particular in my booke, is a refutation and disproofe of all. And for proofe hereof, you cite *S. James cap. 2.* This you also cited, and alledged in your first booke. This is a verie speedy course, and brieve manner of answering and confuting whole bookes, and volumes, if it might be allowed. Howbeit, touching that text of *S. James*, which you so much abuse, and touching that your *Paradoxe*

Jam. 2. 10.

radoxe and strange opinion, you have been before sufficiently answered in my *Reply Chap. 2. pag. 110 111 112* Whereunto you in your *Reiownder* have said nothing. But, admit your *Maier* proposition were true (which is indeede utterly untrue) yet how doe you prove your *Minor*? that is to say, how doe you prove any one point or position of mine, contayned in that booke to be false? Shew, or name that one, which you have disproved, or confuted, if you can: but you are not able to doe it. From henceforth therefore bee not so prodigall of your words. But yet further to derogate from the credite of that my first booke, you say, that it is onely a collection out of Protestant authors: and that you can discover the Bookes, Chapters, and Pages, of *Master Fulke, Master Whitakers, Master Downam, &* of others, whence I have borrowed, *verbatim*, whatsoever is expressed in it. This is too overlavish a speech, and more then you will bee ever able to prove. Indeeede, as touching the substance of the matter, and doctrine, contayned in that my first booke, and in my second, and in this also, I thinke it no shame, but contrarywise I thinke it honour, and reputation, ficely to confesse, that I have learned it of these, and of such other learned, and reverend Protestant Divines: Yea I hold it a part of dutie in me, not onely ingenuously, but thankfully also to acknowledge those my teachers: especially considering, that what they have taught mee herein, appeareth to bee certainly, and irrefutably true. This therefore doth rather adde credite to the matter and doctrine, contayned in those my bookes, then derogate, or take any from them. But was there ever any reader of other mens workes, that was not allowed to take collections out of the, & to make use of the as occasion requireth: yea, if that were an exception sufficient, I might also say, that as touching the matter, all that you have spoken eyther in your first answer, or in your *Reiownder*, is likewise but a collection out of Popish authors and that the Bookes, Chapters, & Pages of *Bellarmino, Stapleton, Suarez*, and of others, might be shewed, whence you have

borrowed, and taken them all. But to what end, were this? For the question is not, what I have learned, or collected out of the one, or you out of the other: but whether of those doctrines, and religions, which wee have severally learned of those our severall teachers, bee the truer, and which of them is approved of God, and by his word: namely, whether Protestantie, or Poperie. Heere then, as touching the substance of the matter delivered in all my bookes, you might have spared your labour: for you have therein tould no newes, nor any more, then my selfe had before, affirmed, confessed, and acknowledged. But you proceede, and say, that although you for your part, have answered but onely to two Chapters of that my first booke (the force of which your answer, I have also overthrowne in my *Reply*) that the whole booke is neverthelesse answered, and compleatly finished, and extant any time these two yeares and a halfe past, and yet not divulged, for want of meanes, and opportunitie for the impression: And, for that cause, doe you desire of mee, that I would bee a meane to procure it to bee Printed, by the Protestant Presse here in *Dublin*. A verie bold, unbecoming, and strange request, to be demaunded, especially at my hands. But if it be (as you say it is) fully answered, and compleatly finished, so long since, why is not printed all this while? For whereas you pretend want of meanes, and opportunitie for the impression: It is well knowne, that the Papists (as fundrie other their workes printed, sufficiently declare) doe if they list, want neyther meanes nor opportunitie for the impression: And I have tould you heretofore, that if your workes, and bookes bee so excellent, and so worthy the printing, as you make shew for, you might get them to bee Printed, eyther at *Doway*, or at *Rhemes*, or at some other place beyond the Seas. And therefore it was altogether idle for you, to give me this election, eyther to receive it in a *Manuscript*, or to procure the printing of it: for it is needlesse to receive it in a *Manuscript*, when it may be Printed: And for the printing
of

To a popish Adversary.

of it, not I, but your selfe must procure it, if you will have it done. So that as touching that choyce or offer, you make mee, I hold my selfe free, and not necessarily tyed or bound, to doe cyther the one, or the other. Yea the very name of a Protestant Presse (if there were no more) might have beene sufficient to tell you, that it were utterly unmeet, for Popish workes to come into it, especially those that bee purposely, and directly made, and contrived, against such cleere, high, and important points, as bee also by law established. Now then to come to my second request: I trust, you likewise finde nothing in it, unreasonable: for I therein desired no more of the answerer, but to answer, not superficially, or sophistically, but substantially, soundly, and satisfactorily, if he could: so that if he could not make such an answer, hee might have said so, and so have beene excused. But you are loth to disable your selfe, and therefore as touching the answer you made to the two Chapters of that my first booke, you say, that I am not to judge, whether it be substantiall, sound, and satisfactory, but that the equall, and indifferent Reader, is to judge of it: which I am well contented, hee should doe, by conferring my *Reply*, with that your answer. And therefore I proceede to my third request: which consisteth of two partes: (for I make not foure requests, or foure conditions, as you surmise:) The first part of that my third request, was this, that I would have him, whosoever was to be the answerer, to answer in love, and charitie, and with an affection onely to follow Gods truth. Thus far I am sure, you cannot denie it to bee a reasonable request. And as touching the other part of it, whereby I desired him that would answer, to put his name to his answer, as I had done to that booke of mine: although this be it, you chiefly except against: yet even this part of it also, was not unreasonable: and therefore did I justly reprove you, for that in stead of your right name, you gave your selfe the wrong, false, & counterfeyte name of *Iohn at Stile*. But yet, in your *Reiender*, you, herein, seeke to excuse & defend your selfe,
by

A Surreplication

by the example of *Abram*, who comming into *Pharaohs* Court in *Egypt*, called *Sarai* his wife, by the name of his Sister: and you adde further, and say, that *Matthew Sutcliffe*, a Protestant writer, did put for his name unto his worke. *O.E.*

Gen. 12. 11.
12. 13. &c.

First concerning *Abram*, though hee were an holy man, yet hee had his faults and imperfections, amongst which this is reckoned for one, which you here alleage: And can then that which was a fault in him, make yours to bee no fault? But yet in all that, hee neyther changed his name, nor his wifes name, into a false, and counterfeite name, as you did. For hee still called himselfe *Abram*, and his wife *Sarai*, without any alteration, or change of those their proper names. And as touching *Doctor Sutcliffe*, the reason why hee put for his name those two letters *O. E.* was, because the man, whom hee answered, had likewise for his name, subscribed certaine letters: but, the case betweene you and mee is not like. For I subscribed my name truely, and as it was, and therefore so should you also have done. Howbeit, at the first, you excused your selfe herein, by reason of the Statute of 2. *Eliz.* which doth (say you, in your first answer) binde mens tongues, and pennes within this kingdome, with the cord of a *Premunire*, from oppugning the Supremacie, cyther by word or writing. Vpon which answer of yours, it is true, I did, and who could otherwise suppose, but that you then thought (whatsoever you say now) that the penaltie for that your first offence against that Statute, in oppugning the Kings Supremacie, was a *Premunire*: For to what end else doe you so specially mention, that to bee the penaltie, if you had not thought so? I did not therefore wrong you (as you now alleage in your *Reiownder*) when

See the Sta- I taxed you being a Lawyer, with ignorance in your owne
tute it selfe, of profession, concerning that Statute. For that Statute doth
3. *Eliz. cap. 1* not (as you then supposed) for any mans first offence, in-
made in Ire- flict the penaltie of a *Premunire*, but (as I then likewise
land. could you) the losse of goods and chattels: after once con-
viction and attainder, it is indeede for the second offence

a Pre-

a *Premunire*: & after twice conviction, & attainder, it is for the third offence, high treason. Did you then account it, a wrong done unto you, that I supposed this to be your first offence, against that Statute? Or would you have had me to think (which was more then I knew at that time & more then yet I know) that you had bin once before convicted, & attained of that offence, & that this was your second offence in that kinde? For, unlesse this were thus your second offence, you needed not to have feared, or mentioned a *Premunire*, to have beene your penaltie in the case: you might as well, & as wisely have named, & mentioned the penaltie, to have beene high treason; in as much as for the third offence, that Statute also maketh it to be high treason, as well as it maketh it, for the second offence, to bee a *Premunire*. But I conceived (as I thinke any man else, not knowing any thing to the contrarie, would have conceived) that it was not any your second offence, nor third offence, that you then, and there meant, or had any reason, or purpose to speake of, but your first offence, the penaltie of which first offence, is, by that Statute, neyther *Premunire* nor high treason (as I said before) and consequently (if you would deale ingenuously) you must confesse, that you then mistooke, and were deceived in opinion, whilst you thought the penaltie for that your first offence to bee a *Premunire*, by that Statute. But then you say, that you will not bee so lawcie, as to taxe mee with ignorance in my profession, concerning the same Statute, and yet you see not (say you) how the subscribing of your name unto the answer, could have beene any legall plea, to have saved you from penaltie, if you had beene indicted upon that Statute: Neyther doe I see, how it could, although you would faine wrest my words from their true sence, unto that construction. For, whereas you have said, that my requiring of the Answerer, to put his name unto the Answer, was, in effect, as much as to debaire any man from answering unto it? I thereunto replied, that hee that in answering, is required to put his name to his answer, is so farre from being debaired from answering, that cleane contrarywise hee is thereby (that is, by such requiring of him to answer in that sort) permitted to answer (if hee please) so as hee put his name

thereunto. I did not say (as you seeme purposely to misconstrue and mistake) that by answering in that sort, viz. with his name subscribed to his answer, he was to be freed from all manner of penaltie contayned in that Statute of 2. Eliz. I was never so absurd, or sencelesse to say or thinke it. Yea you might have observed, that I there shewed and expressely affirmed the cleane contrarie, namely, that the penaltie even for the first offence against that Statute (whether with his name subscribed, or not subscribed, or howsoever,) was losse of goods, and chattels. And therefore whether this were ignorance of that point of the Statute in me, or grosse, perverse, and malicious cavilling, and quarrelling in you, let the equall Reader judge. But yet in your *Reiownder*, you further say: that you cannot imagine why I should so much covet the answerers right name, unlesse it be by advantage of the Statute in persecuting him, to confine him into the Castle, there to argue with him, as the Gaoler doth with his prisoner. I know no reason you have thus to charge me, with so much coveting of the Authors, or Answerers name. For though it bee lawfull for mee so to doe, yet have I not beene much inquisitive after it: much lesse reason have you to charge mee, in your imaginations, with persecuting him, or seeking to confine him as a prisoner within the Castle, which I never did: though I confesse hee deserveth it, and a farre greater punishment then that: because, contrary to the lawes, and statutes of the Kingdome, which himselfe professeth, being (as he saith hee is) a Lawyer; and contray to that dutie, which as a Subject he oweth to our most noble, most gracious, religious, and most worthy Soveraigne Lord King CHARLES, and contrarie to that fealtie also, or fidelitie, which (professing himselfe to bee a Christian) hee likewise oweth unto CHRIST IESVS, the onely spiritwall King, Monarch, & head of the whole Church Militant, as well as of the triumphant, hee doth, and dareth thus audaciously to offend. Neyther is prosecuting, or punishing of such bold, and notorious offenders to bee called (as you after the Romanistickall manner untruly call it) *Persecuting*. For though *Persecution* doth well besit delinquents, and offenders, yet *Persecution* is a word properly, and usually applyed to the Martyrs of Christ,

To a popish Adversary.

13

Christ, and is not attributed to any professors of Antichrist, or Antichristian doctrine, unlesse it bee *Catacrestically*, & abusively. Howbeit I deale not with you by authoritie, or as a Judge, or Iusticer, but doe onely debate, dispute, and reason the matter with you, seeking, and endeavouring first by this meanes, (if I can,) to reduce, and reclayne you, and the like unto you, from those your grand errors, unto a most certaine, and evident truth. But if yet still you urge the Statute of 2. *Eliz.* made in this kingdome, which maketh the penaltie, even for the first offence, to be, although not a *Premunire*, yet losse of goods and chattels, and that therefore in respect of this losse and damage it was not a thing reasonable for me, to demaund an answer with the Answerers name, thereunto subscribed: Thereunto I then further say: First, that I know no reason why you, or any man else, should make any answer, or any Bookes, or writings at all, against the Kings Supremacie, which you ought in all good dutie to uphold, and defend. Secondly, I demaunded not any answer at all to be made eyther by you, or any other; but, if any did, or would answer, then I desired, that hee would answer in that sort, viz. with his name subscribed: so that hee might have chosen, whether hee would have answered, yea, or no: and by not answering, hee might have kept, and freed himselfe from penaltie of the Statute: but if hee would needes answer, then hee was to doe it, at his owne perill, if any perill did ensue. And yet I might also further tell you, that such a one possibly might have beene the Answerer, as needed not to feare that perill, or penaltie. For be there not divers Schollers, in Colledges, and Vniversities, and elsewhere, that live onely upon other mens exhibition, and beneficence, and have no manner of goods, or chattels, lands or tenements, of their owne? Might not such an one have answered, and put his name to his Answer, without any feare of that penaltie. Againe, might not some forrein-borne Papist, living out of the Kings Dominions, and that were no Subject to the King, having well, and perfectly learned the English tongue, have beene the Answerer, and put his name likewise to his Answer, without any feare of that danger. Or, (which was most likely,) might not some English man, or

some Irish man, living & abiding perpetually at *Rhemes, Rome, Doway*, or some other place beyond the Seas, have beene the Answerer? And would you then have thought it a thing unreasonable for such a one to have beene demaunded to put, and subscribe his name to his Answer? For these men living continually beyond Sea out of the Kings Dominions, feare not, (as wee see by experience,) nor thinke, so long, as they be so farre distant that they neede to feare the penaltie, or danger of any Law, or Statute amongst us, to bee executed upon them. Yea, what if it were your selfe, that were the Answerer of it, (as you tooke upon you to be the Answerer of two Chapters in it) had it beene unreasonable to have demaunded of you, to put your name to the Answer, in respect of any feare of penaltie, or danger, upon that Statute, or of any other Statute, whatsoever? For what penaltie or danger upon any Statute, should you feare, who in your first Answer, in the Epistle to your Countrey-men, write so confidently in this your supposed Catholicke cause, as if you feared no manner of danger at all, but would willingly undergoe all disasters in the world for attestation and defence of it? But I am now glad to see, that you have some feare in you: For, indeede, feare in everie man, and not forwardnesse or boldnesse in any, best becommeth yours so bad a cause. But yet further, what reason have you now, in your *Reioynder*, to except against any of these three conditions, or three requests, or against any part of any of them, as unreasonable, which in your first Answer, you tooke no exception against? Yea which you then seemed well to approve and allow well of, saying, concerning the same my whole first Booke, that, *It should shortly be answered in my owne straine of Divinitie with the three conditions required by me.* Yea, lastly if you would needs be, (as you were) the Answerer to a part of that my first Booke, (namely, to two Chapters therein,) and thought it not fit to put your right and true name unto it: yet, should you not, in stead thereof, have given your selfe, a wrong, false, and counterfeyte name, (which is the thing, I reprov'd in you:) For, as I said formerly in my *Reply*, so I say againe, that it had beene much better for you, to have put no name at all to that your Answer, then a false, wrong, and

and counterfeyte name, as you did.

3. From thence, you goe on, and renew a former taxation of yours, namely, for that being a Lawyer by profession. I neverthelesse meddle with these matters of Divinitie, & concerning religion: But, concerning this, I told you before, that I had made a sufficient Apologie for these my doings, in that my first Booke, whereto, as yet I see no Answer made: and I added further in my second Booke, namely, my Reply, that even you your selfe did justifie mee therein, in as much, as you, being likewise a Lawyer, (as you then affirmed, and yet still affirme your selfe to bee,) did neverthelesse meddle with these matters of Divinitie, and concerning religion, as well, as I. Neyther is it any excuse, or defence for you to say, (as you doe,) that I began to commit this fault, and that you doe but follow me therein: For, if you saw it to bee a fault in mee, you should rather have eschewed it, then committed it, upon any mans example whatsoever. He that knoweth an Act to be a sinne, and reproveth, and condemneth another man for it, and yet will himselfe commit it, is not his sinne and fault, so much the greater? *Therefore art thou inexcusable, O man, who so ever thou art, (saith S. Paul,) that condemnest another: for in that thou condemnest another, thou condemnest thy selfe, for thou that condemnest, doest the same things.* Yea, you say further, that in your Answer formerly made, you signified this to be a fault, as well in your selfe, as in mee. But if you then thought so, in verie deede, why did you commit it? Or why doe you still commit, and continue it? For so your Reply declareth: doth not this then more & more aggravate your offence? And doth it not declare you to bee a man of little conscience, that dare thus wittingly and willingly, to sinne against your owne conscience, and to persist also in it? *For, if our heart condemne us, (saith S. Iohn,) God is greater then our heart, and knowes all things.* It is high time therefore for you, to give over writing in these matters of Religion, if it be against your conscience, and that you verily thinke it to be unlawfull for you, so to doe. But, as for me, I am not of that minde, neyther have you shewed, nor can you shew, any sufficient or good reason, to dissuade mee. For, whereas you suppose it to bee unlawfull, or unmeet for

Rom. 2. 1.

1. Ioh. 3. 20

Lawyers, or other lay-men, to meddle with the Scriptures, and matters concerning Religion, as being a thing out of their element, calling, and profession: First, to forbid or denie lay people, the meddling with the Scriptures and with Religion, is knowne to bee an old Popish policie, and a most wicked, and damnable device: by meanes whereof, mens eyes, being in times past thus blinded, and as it were put out, it came to passe, that both Pope, and poperie, in those dayes so mightily pre-
 vayed, as they did, in the world, & yet still prevayle, amongst too too many. For what is it else but ignorance of Gods word, and will in the people that keepeth them so fast fettered and chayned both to Pope and poperie. Secondly the untruth of this irreligious, and Antichristian opinion, is formerly, and at large discovered, and manifested in my first Booke, which I see not yet answered: And yet thirdly, you must further know, (if already you know it not) that a Lawyer, or any other lay-man, hath a double calling, or a double profession: one worldly, which concerneth the things of this life: the other is his Christian calling, which concerneth, & respecteth things belonging to a farre better life, namely to a life everlasting. This Christian calling, S. Paul proveth, desiring men, to walke worthy of that calling, whereunto they are called. Againe, hee prayeth for some, that God would make them worthy of this calling. S. Peter likewise speaketh thus: Yee are a chosen generation, a royall Priesthood, an holy nation, a people set at liber. ie, that yee should shew forth the vertues of him, that hath called you, out of darkenesse, into his marvelous light. And sundrie other Texts of holy Scripture there be, to prove, that there is aswell a Divine, and Christian calling and profession, as there is a worldly, and terrestriall. For what? Have not men soules to looke to, aswell as bodies? Or, are men to bee no more but naturall, and meere men? Are they not also to become Christian men, and to bee regenerated, aswell as generated? And doth not S. Peter tell us, that men are regenerated, or borne anew, not by corruptible, but by incorruptible seede, even by the word of God, which liveth, and endureth for ever. And doth he not further advise some, as new borne babes, to desire the sincere milke of the word, that they may grow thereby. For, men, after that they bee once begotten and borne

Ephes. 4. 1.

2. Thes. 1. 11

1. Pet. 2. 9.

1. Pet. 1. 23.

1. Pet. 2. 2.

Cor. 3. 1. 2.

borne a new, by Gods word, and the power of his spirit working therewithall, are first *Babes* in Christ, and afterward by degrees, they grow to bee strong men, and able to digest strong meates, untill they come, at last, to bee a perfect man, as *S. Paul* speaketh. Yea, doth not Christ himselfe bid men to *Labour not for the meate which perisheth, but for that meate which endureth unto life everlasting?* And did he not also further tell *Marytha*, that shee was troubled about many things, but this was the *unum necessarium*, the one thing that was necessarie, which *Mary* had chosen, namely the hearing of his word? Seeing then that Gods word, (which is now long sithence committed to writing, and is in the sacred, and Canonickall Scriptures to bee found, and where all truth, concerning points of Divinitie, and Religion is to be had,) is so necessarie, as that it is the foode, meate, and nourishment of Christians, to life everlasting: How can it be rightly, and truly said, that when they be thus within their aliment, they bee out of their element? For is not the life of the soule, to bee preserved, and maintayned aswell, or rather much more heedefully, then the life of the body? Or will any say, that the fish is out of his element, when hee swimmeth in the water, where he liveth, and most delighteth? Yea as the fish removed out of his proper element, dieth within a while after: and as the bodie that is destitute of corporall foode to sustaine it, must needs decay, and die. So the soule that hath not this spirituall foode of Gods word, to cherish, and maintayne it in a spirituall life, must likewise needs consume, decay, and pine away, untill it come in the end, to utter ruine. You see then, that a true Christian, (*Who though he bee in the world, yet is not of the world, but hath his affection set upon things that are above, & not on things which are on earth*;) is so farre from being out of his element, as that, contrarywise, hee is within his right, and true element, in respect of his soule, and the things belonging to a better world, and keepeth himselfe within the compasse, & bounds of that his divine, & Christian calling, so long, as hee humbly and reverently, heareth, readeth, searcheth the word of God, delighteth in it, museth and meditateth upon it, talketh of it, and thereout learneth truths and true religion, and propoundeth them also unto others, for their

Hebr. 5. 12.
13. 14.

Ioh. 6. 27.

Luke 10. 39
40. 41. 42.

Iohn. 17. 16

Col. 3. 1. 2.
Phil. 3. 20.

their benefite and instruction, aswell as of himselfe. Yea, all duties of a Christian, a Lawyer, or other lay-man, may and ought to doe, and performe, as hee is able, and as occasion requireth: so that hee doe them discretely, and with due respect to all manner of persons, and so long as withall, hee intrudeth not into those duties, that bee proper, and peculiar to the office, and function of the Ecclesiasticall Ministers. As for that your other reason, whereby you would dissuade me, because these are points of great difficultie, & surpasse a Lawyers abilitie, (as you speake:) although I arrogate nothing to my selfe, yet why should you say, that it surpasseth a Lawyers abilitie, to deale in these things, when as you your selfe, being a Lawyer, doe neverthelesse intermeddle in them? Or why should it surpasse or exceede a Lawyers talent, or a Lawyers abilitie, in mee, more then in you? Indeepe, if a man be nothing else, but a meere Lawyer, in respect of that his meere worldly calling, he is not fitte to deale in matters concerning God, and his religion; But if hee bee a Christian Lawyer, exercised in the Booke of God, and well grounded in the points of his faith and religion, (as all Lawyers, and other lay-men ought to be,) then in respect of that his divine and Christian calling, hee may meddle with points of Divinitie and Christianitie, *Eatenus, Quatenus*, so farre forth as is before shewed, and as is in my first Booke more at large declared. And yet there is also a more speciall reason, why I should bee permitted to intermeddle herein, because being not onely a Lawyer, but a Iudge also in the Common-weale, it well becommeth mee, and is my dutie, (as I conceive it,) for that reason, (so much as in me lyeth,) to seeke to have the Lawes, and Statutes of the Realme especially in these most high, and most important points, aswell as in other, that bee inferiour points unto them, to be observed of all his Majesties Subjectes within this kingdome. Neyther are there any such great doubts, or difficulties, in these points, as you would perswade: yea, they bee verie cleare, plaine, open, and evident points, and such as any man, though but of meane understanding, may easily, and readily conceive, and apprehend. For, first, the verie name of a Subject, (if there were no more,) may serve to teach any man,

that

that the King, whose Subject hee is, hath of due right a Regall, and Temporall Supremacie, not onely over him, but over all the rest of his Subjects within his owne Dominions : and secondly the verie name of a Christian, may serve to teach a man, to beleeve, and to professe, no other religion, but that which Christ himselfe taught, cyther by himselfe, or by his Apostles, as also, to acknowledge no other to bee the spirituall King, head, and Monarch, of the whole Christian Church, but the same CHRIST IESVS onely.

4. Now then, you are come, at last, to the matter it selfe. Where first of all you affirme, and confesse two Supremacies: the one spirituall, the other temporall. The spirituall Supremacie, or spirituall Monarchie, (which indeede, rightly, and properly belongeth unto CHRIST IESVS,) you attribute unto the *Pope of Rome*. But, by what right? Namely, as being his Deputie; Vicar, or Attorney, (as you call him.) But can you shew any letter of Attorney, or any Letters Patents, Commission, or Warrant from him, or from his word, to prove the same? You have sought long, but could never yet finde or shew, any such warrant. although you have pretended divers, which prove no such matter. If then it bee high treason, in a subject, to take upon him, to bee a Vice-roy, or Lord-Deputie in a terrestriall kingdome, without a warrant, or Commission from his King: Is, it not likewise, as grand & as high a treason, in the Bishop of *Rome* to take upon him, to bee Vice-roy, or Deputie unto Christ, in his spirituall kingdome, without any warrant, or commission from him? But as in the point of the spirituall supremacie, hee thus intolerably wrongeth Christ Iesus himselfe, his Crowne, and dignitie: so doth hee also intolerable wrong to Emperours, Kings, and Princes, and to their Crownes, and dignities, in respect of their Civill, and Temporall supremacie, & authoritie, rightly, & aunciently belonging to them, over Persons Ecclesiasticall, and in causes also Ecclesiasticall, within their severall Dominions. And this to men that bee not extreemely wilfull, perverse, and forward, I have very sufficiently, and abundantly proved, in my first, and second Bookes; whereunto, you neyther in your first Answer, nor yet in your second, (which is your *Rejoyn-*

Ioh. 18. 36.

57.

1 Cor. 15. 25

Ephes. 1. 20.

21. 22. 23.

Deut. 17. 8. 9
10. 11. 12.
13.

der,) have alledged any thing that is of force, or weight sufficient to refell or confute any one Argument I brought, in that behalfe. And herein I refuse not the judgement, of any equall, and judicious person whosoever. Howbeit, in that your *Reioynder*, to prove the Popes supremacie, you cite one Text of Scripture, namely, *Deut. 17.* The wordes whereof, because you doe not fully set them downe, I will here recite, that the Reader may the better perceive, how well or ill, they fitt your purpose: the wordes be these. *If there arise a matter to hard for thee, in judgement, betweene bloud, and bloud, betweene plea, and plea, and betweene stroke, and stroke, being matter of controverſie within thy Gates, then shalt thou arise and get unto the place, which the Lord thy God shall chooſe. And thou shalt come unto the Priests, Levites, and unto the Iudge, that shall be in thoſe dayes, and enquire, and they shall ſhew thee the ſentence of judgement, and thou shalt doe according to the ſentence, which they of that place, (which the Lord shall chooſe) shall ſhew thee: according to the ſentence of the Law, which they shall teach thee, thou shalt doe: Thou shalt not decline from the ſentence which they shall ſhew thee, to the right hand, nor to the left. And the man that will doe presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest, that standeth to miniſter there, before the Lord thy God, or unto the Iudge, even that man shall die: and thou shalt put away the evil from Iſrael, and the people shall heare, and feare, and doe no more presumptuously.* Here, for the honour of the Priest, you ſay, that hee is in this caſe to bee obeyed, upon penaltie of death: and why doe you not ſay aſmuch for the honour of the Iudge, that is, of the civill Magiſtrate? For the wordes of the Text doe ſhew, that diſobedience aſwell to the one, as to the other, was puniſhable with death. But you will ſay peradventure as the Ieſuites did, that the Latin tranſlation, called *S. Ieromes*, was, in times paſt, *Ex decreto Iudicis morietur homo ille*, *By the decree of the Iudge, shall that man die*, that obeyeth not the Priest. To whom that reverend, and learned Biſhop Doctor Biſſon, answereth, that it was a corrupt tranſlation, and that the verie ſame tranſlation, not long ſithence, was not, *Ex decreto Iudicis*, but, *& decreto Iudicis*: hee that obeyeth not the commaundement of the Priest, and the decree of the Iudge, that man ſhall die. This was, (ſaith he,) the text of the Bible, which

In his Booke
againſt the
Ieſuites, part.
3. pag. 33.
34. 35.

which you call *S. Ieromes*, not much more then two hundred yeares since, when *Nicholam de Lyra*, & your ordinarie *Glosse*, did comment upon it: and so they read to this day, as also many written coppies, which I have seene, (saith hee.) And therefore it is no small blemish to the Papists, that, in former times, they had also thus corrupted, even that which they call *S. Ieromes* translation. Hee further sheweth, that the originall *Hebrew*, and the *Greeke* translation of the *Septuagints*, bee also directly against that their then corrupted translation, in this point. And so did *S. Cyprian* also repeate this Text. *Et homo quicumque fecerit in superbia, ut non exaudiat sacerdotem, aut Iudicem, quicumque fuerit in diebus illis, morietur homo ille: Et omnis populus, tum audierit timebit.* And the man whosoever shall in pride, not heare the Priest, or the Iudge, which shall be in those dayes, that man shall die, and the people, when they shall heare of it, shall feare. First then, obedience, is by the wordes of this text, commaunded, as well toward the Iudge, that is to say, the civill Magistrate, as toward the Priest. For you see, the Priest, and the Iudge, therein, to bee not all one, but directly distinguished, yea, by Iudges, as by the chiefe rulers, was *Israel* sometimes governed, and that for fundrie yeares, untill kings were appointed, as the Booke of *Iudges*, it selfe declareth. And when Kings were appointed, both Priests, and Iudges were subject to the Kings, as the Bookes of *Samuel*, of the *Kings*, and of the *Chronicles*, doe shew: And for an evident prooffe hereof, you may take the example, of that godly, and religious King, *Iehoshaphat*, amongst the rest. For hee not onely set Iudges in the land, throughout all the fenced Cities of *Judah*, Citie by Citie, but hee said likewise to those Iudges. Take heed what yee doe, for yee judge not for man, but for the Lord, who is with you in the judgement: wherefore now let the feare of the Lord bee upon you, take heed, and doe it: For there is no iniquitie with the Lord our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts. Moreover, in *Ierusalem*, did *Iehoshaphat* set of the *Leuites*, and of the *Priests*, and of the chiefe of the *Fathers* of *Israel*, for the iudgement of the Lord, and for controversies, when they returned to *Ierusalem*: and he charged them, saying: Thus shall you doe in the feare of the Lord, faithfully, and with a perfect heart. And what cause soever shall come unto you, of your

Nich. de Lyra
in *Deut.* 17.

Lib. I. epist. 3.
8. I. lib. 3.
epist. 4. epist. 9

2. Chron. 19.
v. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.
10, 11.

brethren, that dwell in the Cities, betweene bloud and bloud, betweene Law and Commaundement, Statutes and Iudgements, yee shall warne them, that they trespasse not against the Lord, and so wrath come upon you, and upon your brethren: this doe, and yee shall not trespasse. And, behold, *Amariah*, the Priest, shalbe the chiefe over you, in all matters of the Lord: and *Zebadiah*, the sonne of *Ishmael*, a ruler of the house of *Judah*, for all the Kings matters: and the Levites shall be Officers before you. Deale couragiously, and the Lord shall be with the good. Where you see, that in the time of the Kings, the Iudges, and the Priests also, were subject to the King, and at his ordering, and appointment: For all these, both Iudges, Priests, and Levites, did King *Iehosaphat* thus constitute, and appoint. But now, secondly, observe, that both the Priest, and the Iudge, mentioned in this Text of *Deut. 17.* were to Iudge, and give sentence, not as they listed themselves, but according to the Law; which God himsele had given in those cases. So that the sentence, not onely of the inferiour Priests, but even of the chiefe or high Priest himsele, was not alwayes certainly true, and evermore infallible, (as you say it, was,) unlesse it were directed, and done, according to that law. For otherwise they might, and did erre in their judgements. Yea many complaints were in the old Testament, against them, for their errours, and going astray from Gods law: insomuch, that although they said, (as the Papists likewise doe of their Priest of Rome,) *Non peribit lex à Sacerdote, That the law shall not perish from the Priest,* (*Jerem. 18. 18.*) yet God himsele saved otherwise, namely, that, *Lex peribit à Sacerdote, The law shall perish from the priest,* *Ezech. 7. 26.* And for further prooffe hereof, remember that *Aaron* was the high Priest, and yet that he with the rest of the Priests, and people, erred when they made the golden Calfe. Againe, were they not the Priests, and Prophets, that gave sentence of death against *Jeremie*, Gods true Prophet? was that therefore a just sentence, which was so given against him? Was it not also in a Councell, that *Ananias* the high Priest, commaunded men that stood by, to smite *S. Paul* on the mouth? was it therefore well done, and justifiable? Was not, (moreover,) the high Priest present in that Councell, which commaunded the Apostles to teach no more

in the name of I E S U S ? was that therefore a good commandment? or a good and allowable decree, that was thus made against them? Yea, was not the high Priest present in that Councell, wherein C H R I S T himselfe was condemned? *Math. 26. 59*
 And did not hee, in that Councell, say expressely of Christ, *62. 63. 65.*
 that hee had spoken blasphemie? It is then verie apparant, that *66.*
 not onely the inferiour Priests, but even the high Priest also, though joyned, & assembled with others in a Councell, might neverthelesse possibly erre, and did erre sometimes, in his sentence, and giving of judgement. And therefore, so also may the Pope of Rome erre, not onely as hee is singly considered by himselfe, but even though hee be joyned with others in a Councell, admitting, that hee were the high Priest, in the Christian Church, which hee is not, as I have shewed in my *Heb. 9. 11.*
Hebr. 5. 5.
Heb. 4. 14.
Heb. 7. 26.
1. Pet. 5. 1. 2
3. 4.
Hebr. 13. 20.
 Reply, pag. 10. 11. whereto you have made no Answer in your *Reioynder.* For the sacred Scriptures, acknowledge no other high Priest, in the Christian Church, but C H R I S T I E S U S onely, nor any other to be the chiefe *Sheepeheard,* or *Supreame Pastor,* over all the severall Pastors, of all the severall flocks in the world, but onely C H R I S T I E S U S. But yet here, thirdly, observe, that this Text of *Deut. 17.* (which you cite,) concerneth onely the Iewish policie, or Common-wealth of the Iewes, as being a part of the *Iudiciall law,* proper to that nation, and which is now abrogated, and abolished. For to determine those harder, and difficulter questions, and litigious cases, concerning bloud, and the other things there mentioned, the partie grieved is required to resort to the *Leviticall Priests,* *Deu. 17. 8. 9*
 (of which sort there be none at this day amongst Christians:) and againe, *To the place, which the Lord their God should choose,* which was in aftertimes, *Ierusalem,* where the Temple was builded, and where *Iehosaphat* also, (according to this law,) erected, and constituted a *Synedrion,* or Councell, consisting of *Levites, Priests,* and of the chiefe of the Fathers of Israel, *2. Chron. 19. 8. 9.* But none is bound at this day, to goe to *Ierusalem,* to have his litigious and doubtfull cases, to bee decided and determined, by any *Leviticall Priest,* or other *Iudges* there: Neyther is *Rome,* that *Ierusalem:* nor is the *Pope* of *Rome,* or his *Priests,* any of those Priests, descended of the *Tribe of Levi.*

And therefore also, will not this text of *Deut.* 17. any way serve your turne, nor helpe to maintayne your Popes so long vainely fancied Supremacie.

5. But I proccede, prosecuting matters, not confusedly, as you doe, but for the most part, in that sort, and order, as they be layed downe in my *Reply*, that so the Reader also may the better and the more easily perceiue, both what you have Answered in this your *Reioynder*, and what, and how much you have left unanswered, as also how good, or bad your Answers bee. In my *Reply* therefore, pag. 1. I said, that *S. Chrysostome*, (distinguishing those two offices, (*viz.*) the Regall, and Sacerdotall,) did say thus: *Ille cogit, hic exhortatur: ille habet arma sensibilia, hic arma spiritualia: The King compelleth, the Priest exhorteth: the King hath sensible weapons, the Priest hath spirituall weapons.* Hereunto you Answer, that *S. Chrysostome* meant onely, that the King with his sensible weapons, (of imprisonment, banishment, pecuniarie mulcts, temporall death, and other penalties,) should force, (when other meanes fayled,) the rebellious children of the Church, to performe their dutie unto their Prince, & Prelate & not, that the Prince hath any power over the Pastor, unto whom, (say you,) by the ordinance of God, hee is subjected; and thus you make the King, to have power onely over such, as you here call the children of the Church, but not over Bishops, Pastors, and other Ecclesiasticall Ministers: and of this opinion you would drawe *S. Chrysostome* to bee, against his owne good will, and liking. But although by his words precedent, and subsequent, (which you so much speake of,) it appeareth that Kings and Princes are to bee subject, to Bishops and Pastors, in respect of the due administration of those their sacred offices, functions, and ministeries, committed to them from God: yet in respect of themselves, and of their owne Persons, hee held them verie clearely, to bee not superiour, but subject, to Kings, and Princes. For whereas *S. Paul* speaketh thus: *Let everie soule be subject to the higher powers: The same S. Chrysostome* saith, (which I mervaile you have so soone forgotten,) that, *omnibus ista precipiuntur, Sacerdotibus quoque ac Monachis, & non solum secularibus.* These things be commanded to all, even to Priests also, & to Monks, and

Chrysost. hom.
de verb. Esa.
id. Dom.

Rom. 13. 1.
Chrys. ho. 23.
in epistol. ad
Rom.

and not to lay, or secular men onely. Yea hee saith further, in the same place, that though you bee an *Apostle*, though an *Evan- gelist*, though a *Prophet*, or whatsoever you bee, you must be subiect to these higher powers. Remember againe, that speaking of the *Emperour*, hee saith, that *Non habet parem ullum super terram*, He hath no Peere, nor equall upon earth. Yea, hee saith of him, that hee was, *Caput & summitas omnium super terras hominum*, The head, and one that had the supremacie over all men upon earth. Yea, *S. Chrysostome* himselfe, did yet further, really, and actually declare this subjection, to these higher powers, even in his owne person: For did not the *Emperour* exile and banish him? And did not hee, though *Archbishop* of *Constantinople*, humbly submit himselfe thereunto, and yeelde obedience? Was not likewise *Liberius*, though a *Bishop* of *Rome*, exiled, and banished by the *Emperour*, and did not hee also quietly submit himselfe unto it, as being done by the *Emperours* commaundement, and authoritie? And was not also *Athanasius*, banished by the *Emperours* authoritie, and did not he likewise patiently, and obediently undergoe it? You see then, that not onely lay people, and such as you call the children of the Church, but even those also that were Fathers in the same, as namely *Bishops*, and *Pastors*, *Archbishops*, and even *Bishops* of *Rome* themselves, were, in those former, and auncient times, subiect to these higher powers, (*viz.*) to *Emperours*, *Kings*, and *Princes*: *Quibus nos etiam subditos esse sancta Scriptura precipiunt*: To whom, (saith also *Pelagius* another *Bishop* of *Rome*) the holy Scriptures commaund, even us that be *Bishops*, and the *Bishops* of *Rome* to be subiect. So that those *Bishops*, in those dayes, performed this subjection and obedience, unto them, as being moved thereunto, out of dutie, and good conscience, and because God, in his holy Scriptures, had so commaunded. But these two points, namely, that, *Emperours*, *Kings*, and *Princes* bee subiect to that authoritie, message, and ministerie, which God hath committed to *Bishops*, and *Pastors*: And, that *Bishops* againe, and *Pastors*, & all *Ministers Ecclesiasticall*, be, neverthelesse, subiect to *Emperours*, *Kings*, and *Princes*, in respect of their owne persons, is largely declared, both in my first Booke, & in my Reply also, as well as here. As for those precedent, and subse-
quent
wordes

Chrys. ad Populum Antioch. homil. 2.

Socrat. libr. 6. cap. 13. grec. & cap. 14. Latine.

Theodor. lib. 2. cap. 2. 4. 13. Theodor. lib. 2. cap. 2. 4. 13.

Pelag. Epist. 16. Concil. edit. Bin. tom. 2. pag. 633.

wordes in *S. Chrysostome*, (which you so often speake of,) even you aswell as I, might verie well have omitted them, as being needlesse to be mentioned, because the matter, and substance of them, was before graunted, and confessed by me, in my former *Bookes*, as it is likewise here againe in this, and yet you never the neerer of your purpose. And therefore you had no cause to complaine of the omission of the by me, when the recitall of them by you, will do you no more good, nor prove, or inferre any more matter in your behalfe, then that which was formerly by me confessed, and granted unto you: But least reason of all, had you to insinuate, as though by omission of those precedent, and subsequent wordes, I had a meaning to delude my Reader, by concealing the truth: For you see, that I had no such purpose, or meaning, to conceale that truth, which my selfe had formerly delivered, and graunted, and which I still confesse with *S. Chrysostome*, touching the subjection of Princes to Gods authoritie, committed to his Ministers: But it is your selfe in verie deede, which abuse, & delude your Reader, in this case, by concealing truth. For although you tell some truth, you tell not the whole truth, as you ought, but conceale a part of it, or, (which is worse,) you denie a part of it, inasmuch as you affirme, the subjection of Emperours, Kings, and Princes, to that authoritie, which God hath committed to his Bishops, and Pastors. But the other part of truth, concerning the subjection, which Bishops, Pastors, and all Ecclesiasticall Ministers, (aswell as lay people,) owe and are to performe to Emperours, Kings, and Priaces, in respect of their owne persons, this you conceale, and doe not affirme: Yea, you doe directly denie it, although *S. Chrysostome*, (as here is manifest) doth directly affirme it. Henceforth therefore wrong not *S. Chrysostome* in this point as you doe, nor delude your Reader any longer with these your false Comments and untrue surmises.

6. But in my *Reply pag 2*. I further cited the text of *1. Tim. 2. 1. 2.* where *S. Paul* exhorteth Christians, to pray chiefly, & especiall for Kings, and all that are in authoritie, that, under them, *We may lead a quiet, and peaceable life, in all godlinesse, and honesty,* (which you say, I English thus,) in all godlinesse, and honestie,

stie. But you are deceived: for, although I put these wordes
 so together in the English, yet I make them not all, to
 be the English of those Greeke wordes. Everie meane Grecian
 knoweth, that the English of those Greeke wordes, ἐν παντι ἐν-
 σεβᾶα, is no more, but in all godlinesse: but I added the other
 wordes, (and honestie,) not as being signified by those for-
 mer Greeke wordes, but as being other wordes, annexed in the
 English Text, the Greeke whereof, I did not then mention,
 which is, καὶ σεμνότητι. Now all being put together, both ac-
 cording to the Greeke, and English, the text is, (as I rightly
 recited it,) in all godlinesse, and honestie. And therefore in all this
 you doe but *Nodum in sipso querere*, which becommeth you
 not. But why doe you further say, that I cite this Text to no
 purpose: I shewed you in my Reply, to what end and purpose,
 I cited it: namely, to declare, that Kings and Princes, are to
 respect as well pietie, godlinesse, and religion, as civill hone-
 stie, and correspondencie of humane societie. For, beside, that
 the wordes of the Text, doe plainly import somuch, can
 any reasonable man suppose, that eyther *S. Paul* would ex-
 hort Christians, or that Christians themselves would pray for
 Kings, and Princes, for this respect, and to this end onely that
 they should maintayne externall worldly peace, civill hone-
 stie, and humane societie, without any respect or regard had at
 all, unto pietie, godlinesse, and to that Christian religion, they
 held and professed, and which they more esteemed then their
 lives, and more then all earthly treasures and worldly happi-
 nesse whatsoever? Yea, to this end, and purpose it was, that
 I there also mentioned some speeches of *Iustinian*, *Valentinian*,
 and *Theodosius*, Emperours, testifying, and declaring their
 chiefe care within their Empyres and Dominions, to be, for,
 and concerning Gods religion: whereunto you have not an-
 swered. But yet for further prooffe hereof, I alledged in the
 same my Reply pag. 3. that cleere testimonie also of *S. Augu-*
stine, where hee sheweth, that It is enioyned Kings from God, that
 in their kingdomes, they should commaund good things, and forbid evill
 things not onely such things, as belong to humane societie, but such
 things also, as belong to Gods religion. You say, the wordes of
S. Augustine, be these. In this, Kings, as they bee commaunded

E

from

*Aug. contra
 Crescon. lib 3
 cap 51.*

from heaven, doe serve God as they be Kings, if in their Kingdomes, they commaund good, prohibite ill, not onely what pertaynes to humane societie, but also what pertaynes to divine religion. Let the wordes bee as you relate them, all commeth to one effect, as touching that purpose for which I alledged him. For what? Is it not all one in sence, to say, that Kings are enjoyned from God, and Kings are commaunded from heaven? For when you say, that Kings are commaunded from heaven, I make no doubt, but you meane thereby, the same thing that I doe, when I say, it is enjoyned Kings from God: & when you say againe, that Kings doe, (as they are commaunded from heaven,) serve God as Kings, if in their Kingdomes, they commaund good, and prohibite ill, not onely what pertaynes to humane societie, but what also pertaynes to divine Religion: Doe not these wordes of yours, as clearly, and as strongly prove, the Kings authoritie, in matters Ecclesiasticall, and concerning Religion, as my wordes doe, when I say, that it is enjoyned Kings from God, that in their Kingdomes, they should commaund good things, and forbid evill things, not onely such things, as belong to humane societie, but such things also, as belong to Gods religion? Yea, even your selfe, forced by the unresistable evidence of this testimonie of *S. Augustine*, doe at last yeeld, and graunt, that Kings may commaund in things belonging to religion: But then what those things bee, which the King may commaund, belonging to religion, you seeme to say, that they be Theft Rape, and such like. And yet you cite the same *S. Augustine*, affirming, that *utilissimum, & saluberrimum est, &c.* It is most profitable, and expedient, that the King make lawes to restrain the free will of man, from transgressing in such things, as the law of God doth intimate unto us. Hereby, you may perceive, that you needed no better confuter then your selfe. For be onely, Theft, Rape, and such like civill offences, prohibited by the law of God? And be not Idolatrie, false worship, blasphemie, and other offences against God and his religion, by the same law of God also prohibited? Yea, *S. Augustine* himselfe, (as you see,) here distinguisheth betweene things belonging to humane or civill societie, and things belonging to divine religion: and therefore you must not confound those things, which hee hath so
directly

directly distinguished. Now, Theft, Rape, and such like offences, concerne civill, or humane Societie, and bee offences against the second Table of Gods Law: but there be also offences, that bee done immediatly against God, which bee comprised in the first Table of his Law. And did you never reade nor heare, that the King is, *Custos utriusque Tabule*, The keeper of both the Tables? Deut. 17. 18. Why was the Booke of Gods law, at the first institution of Kings in the Common-weale of Israel, required to be delivered to the King? And why was hee charged to reade therein, all the dayes of his life, and to keepe all the wordes, and ordinances contayned in it, if hee were not aswell to see the duties of the first Table of the Law, as of the second, to bee observed within his kingdome? For, the Booke of Gods law, comprehendeth more then the duties of the second Table. And you must observe that this was enjoyned to him, not in respect of his private conversation onely, as hee was a man, but in respect of his Regall and Princely office and function specially: For, when he was set upon the throne of his Kingdome, then it was, that, he was enjoyned these things, as the verie wordes of the Text it selfe, doe expressely testifie. Wherefore, well spake S. Augustine, That a King serve. h God one way, as hee is a man, and another way, as he is a King: as hee is a man, hee serveth God by living faithfully: As hee is a King, hee serveth God in setting forth lawes to command, that which is good, and to remove the contrary. So that Kings, as Kings, serve God, in doing that for his service, which none but Kings can doe. Yea, that Kings may punish Idolatrie, blasphemie, sacriledge, schisme, heresie, and all the offences against the first Table, aswell as Thefts, Rapes, Murthers, Adulteries, and other offences against the second Table of his law, S. Augustine yet further directly sheweth against the Donatists, saying. C y thus, if, you dare, let murthers be punished, let adulteries be punished, let other degrees of lust, and sinne, be punished: onely sacriledges, (that is, wronging of Gods truth, and his Church,) we will not have to be punished by Princes lawes. Againe, he speaketh thus. Will the Donatists, though they were convinced of a sacrilegious schisme, say, that it belongeth not to the Princes power to correct, or punish these things? Is it, because such powers, doe not extend to corrupt & false religion? The workes of the flesh, S. Paul reckoneth

Aug. epist. 50

Aug. contr. 2.
Gaudentis e-
pist li. 2. c. 11

Aug. contr.
epist. Parmen.
lb cap. 7.
Galat. 5. 19.
20 21.

Cont. Epistol.
Parmen. libr.
cap. 7.

reckoneth to be these: *Adulterie, fornication, uncleannesse, wantonnesse, idolatrie, witchcraft, hatred, debate, emulation, wrath, contentions, seditions, heresies, envie, murtherers, drunkennesse, gluttonie, and such like.* What thinke these men, saith S. Augustine? May the crime of idolatrie bee iustly revenged by the Magistrate? or may witches be rightly punished by the rigor of Princes lawes? and yet will they not acknowledge, that heretickes and schismatickes, may be repressed by the same, when S. Paul rehearseth them altogether with the other fruites of iniquitie? Will they reply, that earthly powers are not to meddle with such matters? To what end, then, doth he beare the

Luke 14. 23

Aug. cont. 2.

Gaud. Epist.

lib. 2. cap. 17.

Epistol. So.

cont. 2. Gaud.

epist. lib. 2. cap

17. & epistol.

48.

sword, which is called Gods minister, serving to punish malefactors? Christ saith in the Gospell: Goe out into the high wayes, and hedges and compell them to come in, that mine house may be filled. Wee take wayes, (saith S. Augustine,) for heresies: and hedges, for schismes: because, wayes, in this place, signifie the diversenesse; and, hedges, the perversenesse of opinions. If then those that be found in the high wayes, and hedges, that is in heresies, and schismes, must be compelled to come in, let them not mislike, that they be forced: For this commanding by Princely power, occasioneth many to be saved, who though they be violently brought to the feast of the great householder, and compelled to come in, yet being there, they finde cause to rejoyce, that they did enter, though at first against their wills. But here you tel me, (though somewhat unseasonably,) that you cited in your Answer, a Decree or Canon, made in the first Councell of Nyce, declaring evidently, that the Bishop of Rome, (whom you unjustly, and untruely call, the supream Pastor of the whole Militant Church,) had the Supreamacie in that time, & that unto this pregnant prooffe produced by you. I onely reply, as Maskers doe with *Mumme*. Why? what needed any reply at all unto it? For I had answered it before, in my first Booke, cap. 1. pag. 12. Where I affirmed, and shewed it to bee a forged, and counterfeyte Canon, by diverse Councils, as namely by the sixth Councell of Carthage, cap. 3. by the Affrican Councell, cap. 92. & 101. & 105. and by the Milevitane Councell, cap. 22. Yea the verie fifth, and sixth Canons, (which bee confessed to bee undoubtedly true Canons,) of the Councell of Nyce, doe themselves sufficiently declare, that other Canon, (which you, and other Papists also alledge,) to bee false, and forged. And not onely

To a popish Adversary.

31

onely those Councils, but the Decrees of other Councils also, decreeing against the supremacie of the Bishop of Rome, (as is shewed in the same my first booke, c. 1. p. 16. 17. 18.) do therby likewise consequently declare, that Canon of the Councell of Nice, which you speake of, to be a new forged thing. But if you desire yet further prooffe thereof, against the objections, and allegations that Papists make in this case, then reade that Booke of jurisdiction, *Regall, Episcopall, Papall*, made by that worthy, learned, and reverend Bishop Doctor Carleton, cap. 5. pag. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. And reade also for the same purpose, *The Catholicke Appeale* for the Protestants made by that reverend, worthy, and learned Bishop Doctor Morton, lib. 4. cap. 8 pag. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. and there shall you see this Canon, so fully maintayned to bee forged against the adversaries, as that it is now a shame for you, or any other Papist, to cite or produce it, for a witnesse of the Popes supremacie. But upon such false, and forged testimonies, it is, that the Popes supremacie, is chiefly founded. Howbeit I hope by this time, you perceive, that howsoever, the Pope, and Poperie, have beene heretofore long maskers in the world, and gone disguised, yet at last they have beene discovered, and made knowne to bee such, as they bee indeede: and, that it had beene much better for you, to have beene mute, or mum, then by this your provocation, to have occasioned, the shame, and ignominie of the Pope, and Popish Church, in the point, of forgerie to be thus displayed, and layd open, as also you may here see, that I have no way wronged *S. Augustine*, or wrested him to a wrong construction, (as you calumniate,) when I alledged him, to prove the Kings authoritie aswell in matters Ecclesiasticall, and concerning Religion, as in matters Civill, and Temporall. Which that you, and everie man else, may yet the better, and the more fully perceive, I have here thought it good to set downe, his owne verie wordes in *Latine*, *Aug. contra Crescon. lib. 3. cap 51.* and they be these: *In hoc enim Reges sicut eis divinitus præcipitur, Deo serviunt, in quantum Reges sunt, si in suo regno, bona iubeant, mali, prohibeant, non solum quæ pertinent ad humanam societatem, verum etiam, quæ ad divinam religionem.* For in this, (saith he,) doe Kings, as is commaunded them from God, serve as they be Kings, if in their

their kingdomes, they command good things, and forbid euill things, not onely those things, which belong to humane societie, but those things also, which belong to Gods Religion. Can any thing be more plainly, or more directly spoken for prooffe of this point?

7. Here then you may withall perceiue, the truth of that distinction, which I used in my Reply (cap. 1. pag. 4.) For where- as you, in your Answer, amplifying the Sacerdotall, or spir. tual power, had said that how much the soule in perfection exceeds the bodie: the eternall blisse, the temporall felicitie: the diuine lawes, the humane lawes: By so much did the spirituall authoritie exceede the temporall: Thereunto I replied, and sayed, that whilst you thus spake, you should haue remembered, and observed, wherein, and in what respects it was, that this excellencie of the one above the other, did consist. For as it is true, that in respect of converting soules, and fitting them for Gods kingdom, by preaching of Gods word, administering of the Sacraments, and exercise of the Ecclesiasticall discipline, the spirituall function, and authoritie is to bee preferred before the Regall, or Temporall: So no lesse true is it, that in respect of the temporall power of the sword, externally to command, compell, and to punish offenders, in causes both Ecclesiasticall, and Ciuill, the Regall, and temporall office, and authoritie, is to bee preferred before the Episcopall, or Sacerdotall. This distinction, because it killeth, and striketh dead your cause, you cannot endure, and therefore doe you, in your Reioynder ex- clayme against it, and call it a distinction never heard of before, and that it was lately hatched in the Vniuersitie of Mollinmighan, (as you scoffingly speake,) in the Colledge there, of your owne diuising and nomination, and whereof you are the father, and the founder. But, (to let this passe, as an idle fiction of a fantastickall braine,) why will you not acknowledge the truth of this distinction, which is so cleare, plaine, and evident in it selfe? The first part of it, you neyther doe, nor can denie, namely, that in respect of converting soules, and fitting them for Gods kingdom, by preaching of Gods word, administering of the Sacraments, and exercise of the Ecclesiasticall discipline, the spirituall office and authoritie is to bee preferred before the Regall, or Temporall. For this is, verie apparant, even by S. Chrysostome himselfe, who speaketh

Chrys. in Mat
hem. 83. Ad
popul. antioch
homil. 60.

To a popish Adversary.

33

Speakeeth to Ecclesiasticall Ministers on this wise No small vengeance, (saith hee,) hangeth over your heads, if you doe suffer any heinous offender, to be partaker of the Lords Table: his blood shall be required at your hands, whether hee be a Captaine, Lieutenant, or a crowned King, forbid him: in these cases, thy power is greater then his. Againe hee saith. *Si vis videre discrimen, quantum absit Rex à Sacerdote, expende modum potestatis, utrique tradita.* If you will see the difference, how great it is, betweene the King, and the Priest, weigh the measure of the power, or authoritie, graunted unto them both. And there shewing the power, and authoritie, which God hath committed to the Priest, he saith: *Ego Deus, ipsum regale caput sacerdotis manibus subiecit*: and in that respect, (saith hee,) hath God subiected the head of the King, to the hand of the Priest. So that it is onely in respect of their Ministerie, power, and authoritie, graunted them from God, & not in all respects, nor to all intents, and purposes, that this their excellencie and preeminencie consisteth. Yea, he further sheweth, that their power and offices, bee distinct, and limitted, and that the one may not intrude into the office, and bounds of the other. For, when King *Vzziah*, otherwise called *Ozias*, entred into the Temple to burne Incense, which pertayned to the Priests office, and not to the King: *S. Chrysostome*, reprovng and condemning this, saith thus unto the King: *Mane intra tuos terminos; alij sunt termini Regni, alij termini sacerdotis*: Keepe you within your owne bounds: For, the limits or bounds of the Regall calling, be one: and the limits or bounds of the Sacerdotal calling be another. And againe hee saith, that, *Res est mala, non manere intra fines, nobis à Deo praescriptos*. It is an ill thing, not to abide within the limits or bounds prescribed unto us of God. Hee againe thus distinguisheth their offices: *Regi, corpora commissa sunt: sacerdoti, animae. Rex maculas corporum remittit, Sacerdos autem maculas peccatorum: Ille cogit, hic exhortatur: Ille necessitate, hic consilio: Ille habet arma sensibilia, hic arma spiritualia. Ille bellum gerit cum barbaris, mihi bellum est adversus Demones*. To the King, (saith he,) are bodies committed; to the Priest, soules: the King remitteth the spots of the bodies, the Priest the spots of sinnes. The King compelleth, the Priest exhorteth, the one with necessitie, or constraint, the other with advice, or counsaile: The King hath sensible weapons, the Priest

Chrysost. de
verb. Esa. vidi
Dom. hom. 5.

2. Chron. 26.
16. 17 18.

Chrysost. de
verbis Esaie
vidi Dom. ho-
mil. 4.

Homil. 5.
Idem ibidem.
hom. 4.

hath

hath spirituall weapons : The King maketh warre with the Barbarians, and the Priest hath warres against the Divels. Againe hee saith : *Regi, ea quæ hic sunt, commissa sunt : mihi celestia : mihi quum dico, sacerdotem intelligo.* To the King are those things committed, that bee here : To mee, are things heavenly committed : And when I say to mee, I meane (saith hee) the Priest. So that, although hee there affirmeth the Sacerdotall power, or office, to bee more excellent or greater, then the Regall, yet withall hee sheweth you wherein, and in what respects it is, namely, (as I said before,) in respect of those things, which properly belong to the office, ministerie, and function of a Priest, or Bishop : of which sort, is preaching of Gods word, administering of the Sacraments, and binding and loosing of sinners, by *Excommunication*, or *Absolution*, as the case requireth : But hee may not by vertue of that his Ecclesiasticall and Priestly office, use any externall, civill, coactive power or compulsion, which you see, even by the evident testimonie of the same *S. Chrysostome* himselfe, rightly and properly belongeth to the King, and not to the Priest. Now then here you may perceive withall the other part of my distinction to be likewise undoubtedly true, namely, That in respect of the Temporall power of the sword, thereby externally to commaund, compell and to punish offenders, in causes both Ecclesiasticall, and Civill, the Regall, and temporall office, and authoritie, is to bee preferred before the Episcopall, or Sacerdotall. For it is cleare that God hath committed this Civill and Temporall sword, onely to Kings and Princes, and such like terrestriall Potentates, and not to Bishops or Priests : For so also doth *S. Paul* himselfe directly shew. And who is there but hee knoweth that it properly appertayneth to the power, & office of this civill and temporall sword, to commaund, compell, and to punish offenders, civilly and in a temporall manner ? For the same Apostle saith of everie of these higher powers, that beare this temporall Sword, that hee beareth it not in vaine. Yea hee saith, that hee is the Minister of God, a revenger unto wrath to him that doth evill. Here is no exception of any person, or of any cause, but hee that offendeth, or doth evill, bee hee a lay-man, or a cleargie-man, or be he an offender in a cause Civill, or cause Ecclesiasticall, hee appeareth to bee subject to this

this sword, and authoritie of these higher powers. For, seeing the expresse wordes of the Text, be, *Let everie soule be subject to the higher powers: Who,* (saith S. Bernard,) hath excepted you, (speaking to an Archbishop,) from this generalitie. Hee that bringeth in an exception, (saith hee,) useth but a delusion. And you may remember, that even S. Chrysostome also himselfe, as hee subjecteth Kings to Bishops, Priests, and Pastors, in respect of their power and commission graunted them from God: So on the other side, in respect of the Regall sword, power, and authoritie, given and graunted likewise from God, to Kings and Princes, he declareth verie fully that Bishops, Priests, Pastors, and all Ecclesiasticall Ministers whatsoever, as well, as lay people, are to be subject to them. But this point concerning the subjection of all Bishops, Priests, and Pastors, and even of the Bishop of Rome himselfe, as well, as of others, unto Emperours, Kings, and Princes, as also in causes even Ecclesiasticall, as well, as Civill, and temporall, is so cleerely, plainly, and plentifully proved, both in my first, and second Bookes, and in this also, (all your answers, evasions, quirkes, and quiddities, being therein, utterly frustrated, confuted, and confounded,) as that it is to mee a matter of wounder, that you should not see, and so acknowledge the truth of it. But it seemeth you cannot see the wood for trees, which I am sorrie for.

8. Howbeit to make this point, yet the more evident, (viz,) the subjection of Priests, and Ecclesiasticall Ministers, unto the King: and therewithall, the Kings supremacie, or supream command, over them, even in causes Ecclesiasticall, I alledged in my Reply, cap. 1. pag. 5 the example of Moses, who commanded not onely the Levites, and that in a matter Ecclesiasticall, and concerning their verie office, but hee commaunded also even Aaron, the high Priest, in a matter likewise Ecclesiasticall, and concerning his verie office, saying thus unto him: *Take the censur, and put fire therein of the Altar, and put therein incense, and goe quickly unto the congregation, and make an attonement for them, for there is wrath gone out from the Lorde, the plague is begun, then Aaron tooke, as Moses had commaunded him, &c.* Here you say, I abuse my Reader, by falsely citing this text: for the right wordes, (say you,) are these: *Moses said to Aaron,*

Bernard. ad
Senonen. Ar.
chiepisc. epist.
42.
Chrysost. in
Rom. hom. 23

Deut. 31.25.
26.

Numb. 16.
46 47.

2. Chron. 26.
18.

Dent. 33. 5.
Dent. 31. 25
26. 27.

take the Censer, and drawing fire from the Altar, put incense upon it, going quickly to the people, to pray for them. To pray, (say you,) and to make attonement, doe differ, and be not all one: howbeit, indeede, not I, but, you are the man that abuse your Reader, by falsely citing the wordes of this Text: For you, therein follow the wordes, of your vulgar Latin translation, which is untrue, and unsound, and I follow our English translation, which is according to the Originall, in Hebrew, and therefore true: which you also, if you were a good Hebrician, would know, and perceiue, even in this verie particular. But whether wee take your translation, of *Praying* for the people, or our translation, of *Attonement-making*, it cometh all to one passe, as touching that purpose for which I cited it, namely, to prove, that *Moses* commanded *Aaron* the high Priest, in a matter Ecclesiasticall, & concerning his verie office. For your selfe do say, that, this praying for the people, was a religious act, to bee wrought by *Aaron*, as being intermediate betweene the people, & God, to reconcile, or gaine unto them the favours of heaven. And, on the other side we say, that to burne incense, to make attonement for the people, is likewise expressly, a thing properly pertayning to the Priests office. So that as touching that purpose for which I cited that text, it maketh (as I said before) no difference. But then you go further, & seem to speake, as if *Moses*, had not there commanded *Aaron*. But when *Moses* spake to *Aaron* in this sort: *Accipe thuribulum, Take the cense. Be not these wordes of commaunding, especially in this case, and at this time, being also spoken by a Superior, namely by him, that was as the Scripture calleth him, a king in the common-weale of Israel: Yea bee they not wordes, of as full, and cleere commaund, as when hee spake in like sort, to the Levites, saying: Take the booke of this law, and put yee it in the side of the Ake of the Covenant of the Lord our God, &c. The Text it selfe sheweth that these were wordes of commaunding, in Moses: And so witnesseth also your owne translation, that herein, Moses precepit Levitis, Moses commaunded the Levites. Yea, that Moses, as well as his successor *Iosuah*, commaunded not onely the Levites, but the Priests also, and all the congregation, and people of Israel, appeareth by that answer, and acclamation, they*

gave

gave to the same *Ioshuah*, saying thus unto him: *All that thou hast commaunded us, wee will doe. and whethersoever thou sendest us, wee will goe. As wee have obeyed Moses in a'l things, so will we obey thee: onely the Lord thy God be with thee as hee was with Moses: whosoever shall rebell against thy commaundement, and will not obey thy wordes, in all that thou commaundest him, let him bee put to death.* But then, when you cannot gaine say, but that *Moses* commaunded *Aaron*, and that in matters Ecclesiasticall and concerning his very office: you come to your last refuge, and doe say, that *Moses* was the high Priest, and so, as an high Priest commaunded *Aaron*. But first how doe you prove this, that *Moses* was an high Priest? And yet if you could prove it, what would you, or could you gaine from thence? for your selfe doe say, that *Moses* was as well a king, as a Priest: & therefore why might hee not commaund him, as hee was a king, rather then otherwise? for did he, in his time, commaund the Priests, *Levites*, & the whole People of *Israel*, otherwise, or in any other sort or sence, then *Ioshuah*, his successor did, who was no Priest? how be it, if *Moses* had been both a Priest and a King, would not the holy Scripture somewhere, haue testified, and expressed, so much, as well as it doth, in the like case, of *Melchisedech*. *Gen. 14. 18. Hebr. 7. 1?* For as touching those Texts of Scripture, which you bring to prove *Moses* to be a Priest, it shall by and by appeare, that they prove it not. Againe if *Moses* were the high Priest, what wili you make *Aaron* to be? for it is evident and confessed of all sides, that *Aaron* was the high Priest: and if *Moses*, were also another high Priest, at the same time: then, beside that, there should be two high Priests together at one time, how could the one commaund the other, they being both of equall authority? Or can he be rightly, and truely called, *Summus Sacerdos*, that hath a Superior Priest over him, to commaund him? It is cleere, that the Scripture doth expressly testifie of *Moses*, that he was a King, and therefore of that there can be no doubt: but that he was also a Priest, or an high Priest, (as you suppose) it doth not affirme, no not in that Place, where the purpose of the holy Ghost was to shew, what Offices he bare, during all his life time, and what manner of man he was amongst the *Israelites*, so long, as he had been amongst

*Iosh. 1. 16.
17. 18.*

Deut. 33. 5.

them, vntill that time, that he was to die, and to take his last
 farewell of them: for therein onely appeareth, that he was a
 King and a Prophet, but not a Priest. Had he bene also a Priest,
 no doubt, it would not haue bene there omitted, but specified
 likewise, as well as his other two Offices. Yea reade through-
 out the whole *Bible*, the historie concerning *Moses*, & you will
 full finde, that he was a supream civill Magistrate, a supreme
 Commaunder, and supream Iudge in *Israel*. For it is saide,
 that, *When Moses sate to iudge the people, the People stood about*
Moses, from morning vnto even: And when Iethro Moses' Father
in Law, saw all that he did to the People, he said, what is this, thou
doest to the People? Why sitest thou thy selfe alone, and all the People
stand about thee from morning vnto even? And because this was
 too toylsome & troublesome a businesse for him alone to doe,
 he advised him to appoint some others to help him, & to beare
 the Burthen with him, in hearing & judging of causes. Where-
 upon *Moses* chose able men, out of all *Israel*, and made them
 heads over the People, Rulers over thousands, Rulers over hun-
 dreths, Rulers over fifties, and Rulers over tens. And these iudged
 the people, at all seasons: the hard Causes, they brought to *Moses*, but
 every small matter, they iudged themselves. When, againe, *Moses*
 heard the murmuring, and saw the weeping of the People of
Israel, throughout their families, he was much grieved, and
 speake thus to the Lord: *Wherefore hast thou afflicted thy servant,*
and why have not I found favor in thy sight, seeing thou hast put the
charge of all this People vpon me? &c. By all which, you see that
Moses was, as a King, Prince, or supream commaunder over all
Israel, and consequently, as a King, commaunded *Aaron* and
 the rest of the Priests, as well, as he commaunded the Levites,
 or any of the rest of the People. Moreover, if *Moses* had bene
 the high Priest, he might haue offered Sacrifice himselfe, and
 needed not to haue sent others, (as he did) to sacrifice: neither
 needed he to haue commaunded, or required *Aaron*, to burne
 incense, (as he did) to make an Attonement, for the People, for
 himselfe might haue done it. But whatsoever *Bellarmino*, or
 other *Papists*, hould in this case, you, for your part, doe not
 hould them, to be both high Priests together, at one and the
 selfe same time, but in succession one after another: account-
 ing

To a popish Adversary.

39

ing *Moses*, to be the high Priest, first, and then *Aaron*, afterwards. Howbeit, the Scripture saith, that *No man taketh this honor to himselfe, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron*. If then *Moses* were called of God, to this honor of high Priesthood, let the like warrant be shewed from God, for the Authorizing of him therevnto, that is to be shewed for *Aaron*. But this you cannot shew. Besides, if *Moses* were the high Priest first, and *Aaron* afterward: why doth that Epistle to the *Hebrews*, mention, for the Patterne, or President in that Case, not *Moses*, but *Aaron*? For if *Moses* had bene the first high Priest, no doubt he would haue said, *That no man taketh this honor vnto himselfe, but he that is called of God, as was Moses*: But he saith not so, but he speaketh in this sort. (viz) *No man taketh this honor to himselfe, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron*: As if *Revera*, not *Moses* at all, but *Aaron* onelie were the first high Priest. And so, indeede, S. Chrysostome directly affirmeth, for speaking of *Aaron* he saith expressely, that *Is primus fuit Pontifex, He was the first high Priest*. Againe if *Moses* were the high Priest, so constituted of God, how came he afterward, to loose that honor, or to be deprived of it, and another, namely *Aaron*, to be put in his Place, in his life time, he committing no fault nor any fault declared to be in him, for which he should be deprived of that his Priesthood? But, lastly, what cause, or neede is there, to suppose *Moses* to be, (as you fancy him) an high Priest, extraordinarily elected, and appointed, when there was to be seene at the same time, an *High Priest* after the ordinary maner, in *Esse*, and allowed of God, namely the same *Aaron*. For in my *Reply*, pag. 22. 23. I haue proved, that the Priesthood before the law given, did ordinarily belong to the first borne: and of these two Brothers, *Moses* and *Aaron*, I haue also there proved, that not *Moses*, but *Aaron*, was the Elder, and consequently, that by right of Primogeniture, *Aaron* was the Priest, and not *Moses*. Yea I haue there further proved, that the Priesthood thus being in *Aaron*, was so farre from being removed, or taken from him, that contrariwise, it was continued in him, and afterward confirmed vnto him, by God himselfe, and to his seede, after him. But yet you would prove *Moses* to be a Priest, because he did consecrate, and annoynte *Aaron*, and his sonnes, to the Priesthood.

Hebr. 5. 4.

Chrysost. de
verbis Isaie
vidi Dominum
homil. 5.

Exod. 40. 12.
13. 14. 12.

hood. But to this I have answered before in my Reply pag. 25. 26. shewing, that this proveth not *Moses* to be a Priest, properly so called : for he did this by Gods owne speciall commandement, which he might not disobey or refuse but stood bound to obey and performe, although he were a Civill Magistrate, King, Prince, Prophet, or what office & calling soever hee had. You cite also *Deut. 18. 18.* where God saith thus to *Moses*: *I will raise them up a Prophet, amongst their brethren, like unto thee, &c.* This prooveth that *Moses* was a Prophet, and that Christ, (of whom, these wordes are a Prophecie,) was likewise a Prophet, *Act. 7. 37.* but they prove not *Moses* therefore to be a Priest, because he was a Prophet. But the chiefe text you rely upon, is that in *Psal. 99. vers. 6.* where it is said: *Moses and Aaron amongst the Priests, & Samuel amongst them that call upon his name: these called upon the Lord, and he heard them.* Howbeit, to this also I have answered before in my Reply, pag. 23. 24. First, that the being of *Moses*, & *Aaron*, with, or among the Priests, is no proove, that therefore they were Priests: It is true, that *Aaron* was a Priest, but that is proved by other cleere places of Scripture, and not necessarily deduced out of this: because a man may be among Priests, & yet be no Priest. Secondly, I shewed, that the Hebrew word there used, is, *Cohanim*, which is a word of an ambiguous signification, signifying, as well Princes, as Priests: As for example, *The sonnes of King David*, are said to bee, *Cohanim*, that is, *Princes*, or *great Rulers*: & so it is explicated, and declared in *1. Chron. 18. 17.* And so it is likewise said, of *Ira the Iairite*, that hee was *Cohen le David*, that is, a *Prince*, or *chiefe Ruler* about *David*. For, to conster these, to be Priests, in the proper and usuall signification of the word, they not being of the *Tribe of Levi*, were verie absurd. And to these thus formerly alledged in my Reply, you have answered nothing in your Rejoynder. Yea, *S. Ierome* himselfe, in his owne observation, sheweth, that the Hebrew word, though he translate it *Sacerdotes*, in the one case and *Sacerdos* in the other case, yet signifieth, as I before affirmed. For, saith he, *Ira Iairites erat sacerdos David, id est Magister, sicut alibi scriptum est: Filij autem David, erant sacerdotes, id est Magistri fratrum suorum.* But because you also object *S. Augustine*, as the *Iesuites* likewise did object both

Ab. 3. 21.

2. Sam. 8. 18

2. Sam, 20. 26.

*Hier. tradit
Hebr. in libros
Regum to. 3*

To a popish Adversary.

41

both *S. Ierome*, and *S. Augustine*, in this case, (writing upon this *Psalm. 99.*) to prove *Moses* to bee a Priest : I had rather you should take your Answer thereunto, from the wordes of that reverend and learned Bishop *Doctor Bilson*, then from me: who, answereth the *Iesuites*, and consequently you, in this sort. *All that S. Ierome saith, is this, that Moses had the rule of the Law, and Aaron of the Priesthood : and that eyther of them did foreshew the comming of Christ with a Priestly kinde of Proclamation: Moses, with the sound of the Law : and Aaron, with the Bels of his garments.* Where, *S. Hierome* calleth the Prophetical function of *Moses*, to teach the people, the lawes of God, a Priestly kinde of Proclamation & foreshewing, that the Son of God, should come in the flesh, to teach us the will of his Father. *S. Augustine* useth the word, in the like sence, for that sacred service, which *Moses* yeelded to God, in reporting his lawes and precepts to the people. And therefore in the same place, he saith of *Samuel* also, that hee was made high Priest, which is expressly against the Scriptures, if you take the Priest for him that was appointed to offer sacrifice unto God. For *Samuel* was but a *Levite*, and no Priest, much lesse an high Priest. The sons of *Samuel*, are reckoned in the Scripture it selfe, among the *Levites*, apart from the Priests office, and lineage : And, the high Priesthood, was, long before, given to *Phinees*, and his house, by covenant from Gods owne mouth, and in the dayes of *Samuel*, was held by *Abiah*, the sonne of *Abitub*, who was directly of the descent of *Phinees*. *S. Augustine* elsewhere debating this question of *Moses* and *Aaron*, resolveth in doubtfull manner : *Moses and Aaron, were both high Priests, or rather Moses the chiefe, and Aaron under him : or else Aaron chiefe for the Pontificall attire, and Moses for a more excellent Ministerie.* And in that sence, *Moses* may be called a Priest, if you meane as *S. Augustine* doth, an interpreter of Gods will to *Aaron*, & others, which is the right vocation of all Prophets, that were no Priests, & common to them all, save that by a more excellent prerogative then any other Prophet of the Olde Testament, had God spake to *Moses* mouth to mouth, and face to face. as a man speaketh to his friend. But this doth not hinder his civill power which was to bee chiefe Iudge, and soveraigne executor of Iustice amongst them, and by

In his Booke
call'd, the dif-
ference be-
tweene Chri-
stian subiecti-
on, & unchri-
stian rebellion
part. 3. pag.
102. 103.
Hier. in Psal.
98.
Aug. in Psal.
98.

1. Chron. 6.

Num. 25. 13
1. Sam. 14
1. Chron. 6.

Numb. 12.
Exod. 33.

Bellarmin. de
verb. Dei lib.
3. cap. 4.

by vertue thereof to put them to death, that were offenders against the Law of God. And in his stead, succeeded, not Eleazar, nor Phinees the sonnes of Aaron, but Ioshuah, and Iudah, the Captaines, and leaders of Israel. So farre hee. Thus then you see, in what sence it is, that both S. Jerome, and S. Augustine did, or might call Moses a Priest, and yet not bee such a Priest strictly, and properly taken, as you fancie him: Yea, you see, that S. Augustine likewise affirmeth Samuel to be a Priest, who neverthelesse *revera*, and properly, was not a Priest, as before is shewed: And Bellarmine also himselfe confesseth so much of Samuel, saying expressly. *Samulem non fuisse sacerdotem, sed Iudicem tantum: Non enim descendit ex familia Aaron, sed Core consobrini ejus* 1. Paralip. 6. That Samuel was not a Priest but onely a Iudge: for he descended not of the family of Aaron, but of Core. And he saith further, that S. Hierome likewise, (lib. 1. in Iovinianum,) ostendit *Samulem non fuisse Sacerdotem*, shewed that Samuel was not a Priest.

Exod. 28. 1.
23. 4.

Exod. 29. 1.
3. 4. &c.

In his booke
before named
part. 3. pag.
103. 104.

As for those two Chapters of Exodus, 28. and 29. cited by Bellarmine, whereby he will prove Moses, to be truly, and properly, a Priest. If you reade those Chapters, you shall finde no such matter, but rather the contrary, namely, that not Moses, but Aaron and his sonnes, were the Priests. For God saith there, to Moses: Take Aaron thy Brother and his Sonnes with him, from amongst the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the Priests Office, even Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar, Aarons sonnes. It is true, that, there, you may read that Moses made holy Garments, and offered certaine Sacrifices. But observe withall, that all this was done by Gods owne expresse and speciall commaundement, and to no other end, but this, viz, for the conseruating of Aaron and his Sonnes, to the Priesthood. So that by those two Chapters, it further appeareth, that not Moses but Aaron onely and his Sonnes, were the Priests: But as the Iesuites, in time past, would have proved Samuel, to be a Priest, because it is said, that he Sacrificed: so you say the same of King Saul, that he also sacrificed, and thereby would likewise prove him to be a priest. Howbeit the former reverend, & learned Bishop, D. Bilson, doth againe shew both them and you, how much you deceave your selves, by such phrazes, and maner of speeches

speeches: and that when they are rightly vnderstood, they inferre no such conclusion, as you, and they would deduce out of them. My collection, (saith he,) is grounded upon the law of God. *Samuel* was none of the Sonnes of *Aaron*, Ergo, *Samuel* 1. Sam. 7. was no Priest. It is true, that the Scripture saith, *He tooke a sucking lambe and offered it for a burnt offering unto the Lord*. So *Iephthah* said: *That thing which first cometh out of the Dores of my house to me, I will offer it for a burnt offering*: And yet *Iephthah* was neither Priest nor Levite. So the Angell said to *Manoah*: If thou wilt make a burnt offering, offer it unto the Lord, And yet *Manoah* was of the tribe of *Dan*. Of *David*, that was no Priest, the Scripture saith, *Then David offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord*. And againe, *David built there an Altar unto the Lord, and offered burnt offerings, and peace-offerings and the Lord was appeased towards the Land*. And likewise of *Salomon*: *The King went to Gibeon to sacrifice there: a thousand burnt offerings did Salomon offer upon the Altar. Thrice a yeare did Salomon offer burnt offerings, and peace-offerings, upon the Altar, which he built to the Lord: and he burnt incense upon the Altar, that was before the Lord*. Nothing is oftner in the Scriptures, then these kinde of speeches: By the which, no more is meant, but that either, they brought these things, to be offered, or else they caused the Priests, to offer them: For in their owne Persones, they could not sacrifice them, because they were no Priests. In that sence, the Scripture saith of *Saul*, *That he offered burnt offerings at Gilgal before Samuel came*: not that *Saul* offered it with his owne hands, as you before did fondly imagine and said, *Hee was deposed for aspiring to the spirituall function*: But he commaunded the Priest to doe it, who was then present in the host, with the Arke of God, as the next chapter doth witnesse, in two speciall Places. And as for the reproofe that *Samuel* gave to King *Saul*, it was (saith he,) for distrusting and disobeying God. For when God first advanced *Saul* to the Kingdome, he charged him by the Mouth of *Samuel*, to goe to *Gilgal*, and there to stay seaven Dayes, (before he ventured to doe any Sacrifice,) till the Prophet were sent to shew him what he should doe: But seeing his enemies gathered to fight against him, on the one side; and his people thinking from him on the other side, because *Samuel* came not he began

1. Sam. 7.

Judg. 11.

Judg. 13.

1. Sam. 10.

1. King. 3.

1. King. 9.

1. Sam. 13.

1. Sam. 14. v.

3. 18.

1. Sam. 10.

1. Sam. 13.

to suspect that *Samuel* had beguiled him, and therefore upon his owne head, against the commandement of God, willed the Priest, to goe forward with his Sacrifices, and to consult God, what he should doe. This secret distrust, and presumption, against the charge which God had given him, was the thing, that God tooke in so evill part: And since he would not submitte himselfe to be ruled by God, and expect his leasure, God relected him, as unfitte to governe the People. Neither did *Samuel* challenge him, for invading the Priests Office, but for not staying the time, that God prefixed him, before the Prophet should come. So farre he, whom I thus recite the more at large, for your better satisfaction, in this Point. But yet moreover, that worthy, learned, and reverend Bishop also, *D. Carleton*, amongst other arguments which he bringeth to prove *Moses* to be a Ciuill Magistrate, and a Prince, but not a Priest, alledgeth that Text of Exodus, 4. 16. where *Moses* is said to be, as a God to *Aaron*, and *Aaron*, as a Mouth to *Moses*. The word there used, is *Elohim*, and the same, that is also used in *Psal.* 82. and is never applyed throughout the whole Scriptures, when it is given to men, but to such as were Kings, Princes, Judges, and other Civil Magistrates: and at no time to Priests, vnles they were themselves, the chiefe Magistrates, or received Authority from the Chiefe Magistrate. Give you an instance in the holy Scripture, to the Contrary, if you can, or else confesse the truth of it. And here you may also observe one reason among the rest, which Christ himselfe giveth, why they be called Gods, in that *Psal.* 82. For in that Psalm, it is, that these words are written. *I have said, ye are Gods*: which be the words, that Christ citeth, in the Gospell of *S. Iohn*, and saith thereupon thus: *If hee called them Gods, unto whom the word of God was given, &c.* So that this appeareth to be one reason, why Kings, Princes, and Civil Magistrates, be called Gods, namely, because they have the word of God, given, or committed to them, although not to preach it, (as Bishops, Pastors, and Doctors doe,) yet by way of speciall commission to keepe it, to establish it by Authority, to commaund obedience to it, to punish the Violaters of it, and to encourage countenance, protect, and defend the Professors, and Practisers of it. For it is certaine, that all that Psalm, whence

Christ

In his Booke
of Jurisdiction
Regall, Episcopall, Papall,
pag. 31. 32.
33. &c.

Psal. 82. 6.

Ioh. 10. 34.
35.

Deut. 17. 18

19.

Iosh. 1. 8.

2 *King.* 11.

12.

Christ tooke those words, is wholly, and entirely understood, of Kings, Princes, and such like Civill Magistrates, & not of Priests, Bishops, or other Ecclesiasticall Ministers, as any man may perceave, that will reade that Psalm. Seeing then, this word, *Elohim*, is given to *Moses*, and that comparatively, and in respect of *Aaron* the Priest, it must be graunted, that *Moses* was a Civil Magistrate, and as a King, or Prince, in respect of him, and others, But neither Priest, nor high Priest, as you surmise. And as for that Text before mentioned of Psalm. 99. vers. 6. how much soever you and others, stand vpon it, yet give me leave here once more to tell you, that being well considered, you may, in your owne iudgment, easily perceave, that you can enforce nothing thereout, to prove *Moses* to be a Priest, properly so called, although *Aaron* was: for, the purpose, and intention, of those words, is no more but this, to shew, that not onely *Moses* a Civill Magistrate, but *Aaron* also a Chiefe Priest, amongst the other Priests, and *Samuel* likewise a Prophet amongst others, that called upon the name of the Lord, were all heard of him, when they prayed. Now, because all those when they prayed & called vpon the name of the Lord, were heard, and obtained their requests: is that any argument, that therefore they were all Priests properly so called? No man, I thinke, will be so absurd, as to make such an inference.

9. I therefore now come to *Ioshuah* the Successor of *Moses*: he, (as well, as *Moses*,) did, as a Prince, or King, commaund the Priests, Levites and all Israell, and dealt in matters also Ecclesiasticall as well as Temporall, as I have shewed in my Reply, pag. 6. hereunto you in your Replynder, answered nothing, that is of any weight, or moment. Your best answer is, That what *Ioshuah* did in matters Ecclesiasticall, he did it by the direction and advise of *Eleasar* the Priest: which if it be graunted, maketh nothing to the Question. For the Question is not, by whose direction, or advise, but by whose Authority, those things were done. It is not denyed, but that Priests might, (as was fitte they should,) give their best direction and advise vnto their Kings and Princes: But this derogateth nothing from that Authority, which Kings and Princes have and beare, within their owne dominions. Yea, how impertinent, weake, and feeble

this your answer is, you might have perceived before, by my Reply pag. 9. 10. if you had so pleased. Touching King *Iosuah*, I said in my Reply, pag. 6. 7. That he commaunded the high Priest, as well as the other Priests, and dealt also in matters Ecclesiasticall, and concerning Gods service, and religion: And amongst other Text of Scripture, for prooffe thereof, I alledged that Text of 2. King 23. 4. where it is accorded, that the King commaunded *Hilkiah*, the high Priest, and the Priests of the second order, &c. Hereunto you answer, that there is no such matter in the Place by me cited: and that the force of this Argument, consisteth in these coyned words of mine: The King commaunded *Hilkiah*, (whom you call *Helcias*;) which words not being in Scripture (say you,) I am a wilie Wittnesse for strengthening my cause, to produce so shamefull an untruth, and though I be a Iudge, yet you see no commission I have to use fallshood. These words be able to provoke a mans patience. But you must know, that bad words and a bould face, will doe you no good. Let others therefore iudge, whether you, or I, be the honester man in this Point. You say, there is no such matter in the Place by me cited. Wherefore I desire the Reader, but to turne to that place I cited, which is according to our English Bibles, 2. Kings 23. 4. and according to your Latine Bibles, 4. Reg. 23. 4. and there shall he see, whether there be any such matter, or no: and, whether these words: *The King commaunded Hilkiah*, (whom you call *He'eias*;) be words coyned by me, (as you shame not to speake,) or whether they be in the Scripture it selfe, extant, and apparant. For, first, those words, be in the *Hebrew*: Secondly, they be in our English Translations: and thirdly, they be also even in your owne vulgar Latine Translation. For even in that your owne Translation, the words be these: *Et precepit Rex Helcie Pontifici, & Sacerdotibus secundi ordinis, &c.* And the King commaunded *Helcias* the high Priest, and the Priests of the second order, &c. Now then, is it not Impudency intollerable in you, to deny this. You shall therefore doe well, yee at last, to confesse, that this good, and godly King, *Iosias*, commaunded *Hilkiah*, (otherwise called *Helcias*;) the high Priest, and the Priests of the second Order: and that he also dealt in matters Ecclesiasticall, and con-

cer-

cerning religion, as I there sayed, and have further declared, in the same place of my Reply, pag. 6, 7. To that which I alledged concerning King *Asa*, and King *Hezekiah*, in my Reply, pag. 7. 8. who likewise had Authority, (as is there shewed,) over Persons Ecclesiasticall, and in causes also Ecclesiasticall, you answer nothing in your Rejoinder that deserveth to be replied unto. And concerning King *Iehosaphat* also, your answer is likewise very idle, and friuolous, and scarce worthy the mentioning. For whereas I alledged, amongst other things, That this King *Iehosaphat*, did constitute, or set in *Hierusalem* of the Levites, and of the Priests, and of the Chiefe of the families of *Israel*, for the iudgment and cause of the Lord, &c. (which words were sufficient, to prove my purpose there, namely, the Kings Authority over Priests, and Levites, and in causes also Ecclesiasticall,) you to shew your great learning, and iudgment, in this point, doe taxe me for omitting, or not rehearsing of some subsequent words, in the which verse of that Chapter, which when they be uttered, and rehearsed, doe, indeede make more against you, then for you: for, the words be these. And behold, (saith the King,) *Amariah* the high Priest, shall be the Chiefe over you, in all matters of the Lord: and *Zebadiah*, the sonne of *Ishmael*, a Ruler of the house of *Iudah* shall be for all the Kings affaires. By which words, it appeareth, That King *Iehosaphat*, did as well constitute, and appointe *Amariah* the Priest, to be the Chiefe over that Assembly, Councell, or Synedrion, which he set at *Hierusalem*, for all matters of the Lord, as he did constitute, and appoint *Zebadiah*, to be the Chiefe amongst them for all the Kings affaires. For the words of the Text, put no difference, but that he might, and did constitute, the one to be the Chiefe in the one case, as well, as he did constitute the other, to be the Chiefe in the other case. As for that reason you bring, for a difference, it is nothing worth: for, it is graunted that the King did not, nor could by his Regall Authority, (without a speciall commaundement, or warrant from God,) consecrate, or make a Priest, ne ther is it there said, That King *Iehosaphat*, did consecrate, or make *Amariah* to be a Priest: But he being a Priest before, the King did there constitute and appoint him, (as lawfully he might,) to be the President, or Chiefe in that Synedrion, or

2 Chron. 19
8. 9. 10. 11

Assembly, in all matters of the Lord: as well as he did, or might constitute *Zebadiab*, to be, therein, the Chiefe, or President, for all the Kings affaires.

10. Now then to come to King *Solomon*, I proved him also in my *Reply*. pag. 7. to have had authoritie over the Priests, and Levites, and to have dealt likewise, in matters Ecclesiasticall, and concerning Religion: But to that Text of 2. *Chron.* 8. 14. 15. by mee alledged, for prooffe thereof, you answer not. Onely to that Text of 1. *King.* 2. 27. 35. where *Solomon* deposed *Abiathar*, the high Priest, and put *Sadocke* in his place, you answer and graunt it to be true, that hee did so: But this, say you, hee did, as being a Prophet, and not as a King. This answer of yours, I before confuted, and tooke a way in my *Reply*. pag. 20. 21. whether I againe referre you: because that standeth still in full force against you, you having said nothing against it, in your *Reioynder*. But now I adde further unto it, that it doth moreover appeare, even by the wordes of the Text it selfe, that *Solomon* did not doe this, as a Prophet, but as a King; because hee therein did no more, but execute that, which a Prophet, or man of God, had before spoken from God, concerning the house of *Ely*: For so the words of the Text doe shew, that, *Solomon* cast out *Abiathar*, from being Priest unto the Lord: that hee might fulfill the wordes of the Lord, which hee spake against the house of *Ely* in *Shilo*, 1. *King.* 2. 27. and 1. *Sam.* 2. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. &c. where, the Prophet, or man of God, (as hee is called,) that uttered the Prophecie, and the King that executed the Prophecie must of necessitie bee distinguished. And therefore as hee that received, and uttered the Prophecie is in the receiving, and uttering of it, to bee called, and supposed a Prophet: So King *Solomon*, that was onely the executer, and performer of that Prophecie, is in the execution, and performance of it, to be termed, and deemed a King, and not a Prophet. But whilst I thus prove, the authoritie of Kings, over the high Priest, because King *Solomon* deposed *Abiathar*, and put *Sadocke* in his place: You would inferre, that *Elias*, by the like reason, had the supremacie, because hee, (as you say,) deposed King *Benhadad*, and put *Hazael* in his place. Howbeit, you are therein much deceived. For it is not reade, in like sort, that *Elias* deposed

posed the one King, and put the other in his place. The power to
depōse Kings, belongeth onely unto God, who giveth kingdomes, to
whomsoever hee pleaseth. But what the Prophet *Elias* did, con-
 cerning *Hazael* to bee king over *Syria*, and concerning *Iehu* al-
 so, to bee King over *Israel*, hee had a speciall, and direct com-
 maundement for it, from God himselfe. For the Lord said
 thus unto *Elias*. *Goe returne on thy way, to the wilderness of Da-*
mascus, and when thou comcest, annoynt Hazael to bee King over
Syria: And Iehu the sonne of Nimshi, shalt thou annoynt, to be King
over Israel. So that it was God, (and not *Elias*,) that put downe
 the one King, and raysed up the other. As for *Elias*, and *Elisha*,
 and other Prophets, they were but the publishers and decla-
 rers of Gods will and pleasure, in all such cases, and not the
 depōsers of any Kings. Touching that you say of Queene
Athalia, there was good reason for her to bee depōsed: For
 shee was a meere usurper, and *Ioas* was the true, and rightfull
 heyre. For, *Behold*, (*saieth the Text*,) *the Kings sonne must raigne,*
as the Lord hath said of the sonnes of David. Neyther was it *Je-*
hoida, the Priest alone, but the rest of the rulers, and people
 also, that according to their duties both to God and the King,
 by an unanimous consent, depōsed that wicked usurper *Atha-*
lia, and put *Ioas* in the kingdome, to whom the right of it ap-
 pertayned. For the words of the Text are. *Then they brought*
out the Kings sonne, and put upon him the Crowne, and gave him the
testimonie, and made him King: and Jehoida, and his sonnes, annoynted
him, and said God save the King. And concerning King *Vzziah*,
 otherwise called *Ozias*, (whom you also mention,) it is true,
 that he went into the Temple of the Lord, to burne Incense,
 upon th' Altar of incēse & that *Azariah* the Priest went in after
 him, & with him fourescore Priests of the Lord, which with-
 stood *Vzziah*, & said unto him: *It pertayneth not to thee Vzziah, to*
burne Incense unto the Lord, but to the Priests the sons of Aaron, that
are consecrated, to offer incense. Goe thou forth of the sanctuarie, for
thou hast transgressed, &c. And for this his presuming to burne
 incense, he was stricken with a leprosie: which when *Azariah*
 the chiefe Priest, and the other Priests saw, and beheld, they
 caused him hastily to depart from thence, and hee was even
 compelled to goe out because the Lord had smitten him. So
 that

Dan. 4. 12.

22. 17. 25.

Luke 2. 52.

Dan. 2. 37.

1. King. 19

15.

2. King. 9. 1

2. 3, &c.

2. Chr. 23. 3.

2. Chron. 23.

11.

2. Chron. 26.

16. 17. 18.

19. 20.

that hee was not compelled to goe out of the Temple, by reason of any force, weapons, or violence, offered to his person, by *Azariah*, or any other, of the Priests: but because the Lord had smitten him, (*viz.*) with a leprosie. And therefore even your owne translation, which you call *S. Hieromes*, hath it thus. *Sed & ipse perterritus acceleravit egredi, eo quod sensisset illico plagam Domini.* That hee made hast himselfe to goe out, as being terrified, with the present sence of the Lords blow upon him. It is true, that *Azarias* the Priest, and the other Priests with him, withstood the King. But how? by words onely, as namely, by telling him of his sinne, advising him to goe out of the Temple, and using divine threats, and such other lawfull, and allowable courses, as became Priests to use, but not by swords, and weapons, force of armes, or such like externall power co-active. And thus doth *S. Chrysostome*, also himselfe testifie, even in this verie case, and therefore bringeth in the Priest, saying thus unto God. *I have done, (saith hee,) my dutie, to warne, and reprove him: I can goe no further: Nam sacerdotis est, tantum arguere, &c.* For it is the Priests office, onely to reprove, and freely to admonish, and not, (*saith hee,*) to assaile with armes, not to use targets, not to handle speares, not to bend bowes, not to cast darts, but onely to reprove, and freely to admonish, &c. But if it had beene so, that *Azariah*, and the rest of the Priests with him, had forcibly, and by bodily and externall violence, expelled, and thrust the King out of the Temple, (which neverthelesse you see *S. Chrysostome* expressely denieth to have beene done,) yet were this no prooffe, that therefore, they expelled, deposed, or deprived him of his kingdome. Yea this king, *Vziah*, otherwise called *Ozias*, notwithstanding whatsoever these Priests did against him, and notwithstanding his leprosie, wherewith hee was stricken, was neverthelesse, not deposed, nor deprived of his kingdome. For although he was a leaper, unto the day of his death, and dwelt as a leaper in an house, apart from others, according to the law: yet during the time, of that his leprosie, did hee continue King of *Judah*, and all that while was *Iotham* his son over all the kings house, and indged the people of the land, as a regent, or curator like a Lord Protector, or Lieutenant to his father. Neyther is it said, that *Iotham* his sonne reigned

*Chrysost. de
verbis Esaiæ,
vidi Dominum
omil. 4.*

*Chron. 26.
1. 23.*

raigned in his stead, or governed as a king in his owne right, untill after the death of that his Father. And this appeareth to bee evidently true, by computation of time : for, *Vzziah* lived but sixtie eight yeares in all, as *Iosephus* witnesseth : and hee was fixteene yeares olde when hee began to raigne : and hee raigned fiftie two yeares, as the Scripture it selfe testifieth: So that from the time hee began to be a King, hee continued a King unto his dying day. But what meane you by all this? For if hereby you would proove it lawfull for the Bishop of Rome, to depose Kings, you see that the former precedents, and examples of those Prophets, and Priests, which you produce, doe warrant no such matter ; admitting that the Bishop of Rome were the chiefe or high Priest in the Christian Church, which hee is not as I have now, and often said, and shewed before. Yea they rather declare the cleane contrarie to that detestable, Romish and rebellious position. But if I will needes still urge, that *Salomon*, as a King did depose *Abiathar* the high Priest, and put *Zadocke* in his place : It may bee answered, (say you,) that this act of *Solomons* was *error facti*, and consequently not warrantable *de Iure*. It seemeth by this your manner of answering, that you care not much what you answer, so that you make any answer at all, bee it never so grosse, absurde, or unsound. For first, this your distinction, of, *de facto*, and *de Iure*, in this, and the like cases, I have refuted, and confuted, before in my Reply, pag. 13. & pag. 86. & 87. But, secondly, when the Text it selfe, speaketh of this fact of King *Solomon*, by way of approbation of it, doth it become you, or any man else, to say, or suppose, that it was, *error facti*, in him? Or that it was an Act not lawfull for him so to doe? For hath not the Scripture it selfe, before expressely tould vs, *That Solomon deposed, or cast out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord, that hee might fulfill the words of the Lord, which hee spake against the house of Ely in Shiloh*. Now then, can that be said to bee erroneously or unlawfully done, which God himselfe well liked, and allowed, and would have to bee done, for the performance, and fulfilling of his owne wordes? Yea, consider yet further, that the Kings of *Israel*, and *Judah*, had power, and authoritie over the Priests, not onely to depose them, but also, to put them to death.

Ioseph. antiq. lib. 9. cap. 11. 2. Chron. 26. 1. 3.

1. King. 2. 27.

1. Sa. 22 18.
2. Chron. 24.
20 21.

death. And this you may see in King *Saul*, who put to death divers Priests, and in King *Iosh* also, who put to death *Zachariah*, the sonne of *Iehoida* the Priest: How justly, or unjustly, worthily or unworthily, these Priests were put to death, I here dispute not: but I mention these examples, to shew the power & authoritie that the Kings had in those times, namely even to put Priests to death, as well as lay-persons, upon just cause, and if they did offend so farre, as to deserve it.

11. But, now, though there were a supremacy over the high Priests, as well, as over the other Priests, and Levites, in the Kings, under the Old Testament: and that they also dealt in matters Ecclesiasticall: yet thereupon, it followeth not, (say you,) That Kings and Princes under the New Testament, have the like Supremacy, over Bishops, and other Clergy men, or the like Authority in causes Ecclesiasticall, and concerning religion. Why so? because, (say you,) there is now a change and alteration of the Priesthood, and of the Law. *Heb. 7. 12.* But doth not the same Epistle to the *Hebrews*, (which you cite,) tell you, wherein that Alteration and change consisteth, namely, that it is, in respect of the Leviticall Priesthood, under the ould Law, or under the ould Testament: which is now changed into the Priesthood of Christ, under the new Law, or under the new Testament? why then will you stretch, and extend it any further? yea, neither doth that Epistle, nor any other sacred, or canonically Scripture, testify an Alteration or change, in this Point, or as touching this Particular whereof, we now speake, but the cleane contrary: *videlicet*: that as well under the new Testament, as under the ould, Kings, and Princes are to have a supremacy, over all Bishops, Pastors, and other Ecclesiasticall Ministers, and an Authority also in causes Ecclesiasticall, as well, as civill and temporall, within their dominions. The first part of this Assertion, is manifest, by that Text in the new Testament, which I have so often recited, and where *S. Paul* saith expressly thus: *Let every soule be subiect to the higher Powers: yea, Though you be an Apostle, though an Evangelist though a Prophet, or whosoever you be,* saith *S. Chrysostome* But what shall I neede to prove this so cleere a Point, so many times, and so often? For both in my first Booke, *Cap. 1. pag. 1. 2. 3. &c.* and in my

Rom. 13. 1.
Chrysost. in
Rom. h. 23

my Reply, chap. 1. pag. 39. 40, 41. &c. and pag. 51. 52. 53. 54. &c. this pointe is fully, and abundantly proved. Yea the Bishops of Rome themselves, in former an ancient times, for the space of divers hundred yeares after Christ, did acknowledge this Subiection, to these higher powers, namely to their Emperors: as I have demonstratively shewed by the examples of *Milciades*, *Leo*, and *Gregorie* the great, mentioned in my first Booke, pag. 23. 24. 25. 26. And by *Anastasi* the second, *Pelagius* the first, *Agatho*, *Hadrian*, and *Leo* the fourth, mentioned in my Reply, chap. 1. pag. 11. 12. 13. 19. To all which, though particularly alledged by me, you according to your wonted wise manner, thought it best to answer nothing. Yea, both the parts of this Assertion, namely, that Emperors, Kings, and Princes under the new Testament, have Authority, not onely over Persons Ecclesiasticall, but in causes also Ecclesiasticall, I have so sufficiently proved throughout the first Chapter of my first Booke, and throughout the first Chapter of my second Booke, which is my Reply, and in this booke also, as that all the Power, and force you have brought or can bring against it, will never be able, so much, as to shake it, much lesse to subdue, or overthrow it.

Yet for the more abundant prooffe of this Authority of Emperors and Kings in matters Ecclesiasticall, and concerning religion: I alledged in my Reply, chap. 1. pag. 13. 14. the president, and Example of that famous Christian Emperor *Constantine the Great*: whereunto, in your Reply, you have, (as well became your great learning, and wisdom,) answered iust nothing at all. I alledged also, in the same my Reply, pag. 15. the example of *Iustinian*, that Christian Emperor: where, you deny not, this Emperors making of Constitutions and Lawes, in Ecclesiasticall causes, and concerning Bishops, and other Ecclesiasticall Persons. But you say, those Lawes be not observed, by the Protestant Clergie, and you give an instance in one particular. What is this to the purpose? For, the question was not, nor is, whether our Protestant Clergie, observe those Lawes, and Constitutions, yea, or no: But whether *Iustinian*, that Christian Emperour, made those, or any such lawes, and Constitutions, concerning Ecclesiasticall causes, and Eccle-

fiaticall persons. Now then whilst you graunt, that hee made
 those Lawes, and Constitutions concerning Ecclesiasticall cau-
 ses, and concerning Ecclesiasticall persons, you graunt so much
 as I contended for, that is to say, you graunt the whole matter
 that was in question. And therefore why should I dispute any
 longer with you? Nevertheless, you yet further say, that I
 much disadvantage my cause by alleadging *Iustinian* the Em-
 perour, who accounted & called the Bishop of *Rome* the chiefe
 and head of all the holy Churches. But you should doe well
 to observe in what sence and respects, the Emperour so called,
 and accounted him: namely not that hee had in those dayes,
 a supremacie over *Iustinian* who was then the Emperour: For
Iustinian himselfe testifieth the cleane contrarie to that conceit.
Wee commaund, (saith hee,) the most holy Archbishops, and Patri-
arkes of Rome, of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch,
and of Ierusalem. Yea, the fifth generall Councell it selfe was also
 called by the commandement of this Emperour *Iustinian*. So that
 it clearely appeareth, that hee had the supremacie, & comman-
 ding authoritie over them all. But in respect of the soundnesse
 of the faith, which the Bishop of *Rome* held in those times,
 against heresies, and errors, it was, that the Emperour prefer-
 red him before the other Bishops, accounting himselfe chiefe,
 or head amongst them, for that cause. In which regard also, it
 is, that hee would have the Easterne Churches, to be imitators
 of him, and to follow him. Neither did this Emperour *Iustinian*,
 write unto him, as to an universall or supreme Bishop, in those
 dayes, over all, but onely, as to a Bishop of a Province, or of
 a parte of the Christian world, and namely, in this sort. *Iohanni,*
Sanctissimo Archiepiscopo aemae urbis Romae, & Patriarchae. To Iohn
the most holy Archbishop, and Patriarch, of the famous Citie of
Rome. Againe, in that Epistle, he desired this *Iohn* the Bishop of
Rome, to write his letters to him, and to the Bishop of that his
 royall Citie of *Constantinople*, whom hee there calleth brother
 to the Bishop of *Rome*, (and not his servant, or subject:) Where-
 upon, the Glosse it selfe, maketh this observation, and saith
 thus: *Hic eum parificat: Here the Emperour equalleth the Bishop of*
Constantinople, to the Bishop of Rome. And, indeede, the first Ge-
 nerall Councell of *Constantinople*, consisting of 150. Bishops,
 (Canon.

Authen. const
tit. 15. Novel
123.

Evag. lib. 4. c.
11.
Niceph. lib.
7. cap. 27.

Code. libr. 1.
tit. 4. & lib. 4
fol. 6.

(Canon. 2. & 3.) and the Generall Council of *Chalcedon* also consisting of 630. Bishops. (Act. 16.) and the sixt Generall Council of *Constantinople*, (Can. 36) doe all decree the *Sea of Constantinople*, to be equall to the *Sea of Rome*; except onely, that, in the meeting and assembly of the Bishops, the Bishop of *Rome* was, for Order sake, to have the first Place, and the Bishop of *Constantinople*, the second Place: which, together with the reason thereof, you may see more fully declared in my first Booke, chap. 1. pag. 17. 18.

I alledged further, in my *Reply*, pag. 15. 16. 17. 18. many and sundry Chapters, & Lawes, made by the Emperour, *Charles* the great, otherwise called *Charlemaine*, concerning men, and matters Ecclesiasticall, the Particulars whereof, you may there see: which because you knew not how to answer, you passe them over with this saying, that they are not worth the answering: why so? in regard. (say you,) there is thereby no more discovered, then by those before mentioned of *Iustinian*. And is not that inough, if it were no more but so? and yet is there more discovered in the one, then in the other. Howbeit, the Lawes of those two Emperours, (vizt,) both of *Iustinian* & *Charlemaine*, I alledged not to any such end, as you still, & evermore, untruly suppose, (vizt,) thereby to prove the Spirituall Supremacy, to belong to Emperours, or Kings, (for the spirituall Monarchy and Supremacy, I attribute, (as I said before,) neither to Emperour, nor King, nor to Pope, nor Prelate, but to Christ Iesus onely, the sole Monarch, and head, of his whole Church,) but to this end, and purpose onely, namely to prove, that Emperours, and Kings, had in those former, and auncient times, Authority over Persons Ecclesiasticall & in causes also Ecclesiasticall: which because you neither doe, nor can deny, what doe you else but graunt them: & consequently, you here graunt once againe, the thing that is in question, as a matter cleere, and vadenyable: and therefore what neede I to dispute or debate this matter (any longer) with you? But here, (if I doe not mistake you,) you seeme much to restraine the Power and Authority, of Emperours, and Kings, as though they might not make any new Lawes, or Constitutions, but onely strengthen, confirme, and put in execution, the olde, and former Ecclesiasticall

14. 2. 36
5. 31.
John. 18. 36.
37.
1. Cor. 15. 25
Heb. 1. 8. 13.
Ephes. 1. 20.
21. 22. 23.
Coloss. 2. 10.
8. 19.

clesiasticall lawes: If this be your meaning, you see how this conceit is confuted & confounded, even by those former precedents and examples of *Iustinian*, and *Charlemaine*. For it is evident, that *Iustinian*, made many new lawes, and new Constitutions, which were not before: and so did also *Charles the Great*, frame and make divers and fundrie new lawes, Chapters, and Constitutions. And did not *Constantine* that first famous Christian Emperour also make many new Lawes, and new Constitutions, concerning Ecclesiasticall persons, and Ecclesiasticall matters, which were not made before his dayes? You may also remember, that *S. Augustine* saith: *Serviant Reges Christo leges ferendo pro Christo: Kings serve Christ by making lawes for Christ.* And therefore they may, as occasion requireth, as well make new lawes for Christ, as commaund those, that were formerly made for him, to bee put in execution. But if you meane, that you would have Emperours, and Kings, to make no lawes, nor cause any to bee put in execution, concerning the Church, but such as will well stand with the Lawes of God, his truth, Religion, and Ordinances, you therein say the same thing that Protestants doe. For they say with *S. Paul*, that they may doe nothing against the truth, but for the truth. And, that the power, & authoritie of Emperours, Kings, and Princes, (if it be rightly used, and not abused,) is for God, and not against God, and for Christ, his Church, and Religion, and not for Antichrist, or any untruths, heresies, or errors whatsoever. Or if your meaning bee, that you would have Emperours, Kings, and Princes, in their making of lawes, concerning God, his Church, & Religion, to take the advise, direction, & counsell, of godly, learned, & Orthodoxe Bishops, and teachers, this is, also not denied, but graunted unto you: But then must you graunt on the other side, that if they bee not Orthodoxe Bishops, and true teachers, but false teachers, or if they be such as deliver errors, in stead of truths: such mens erroneous counsailes, directions, and advises, are not to be followed, but to bee rejected, as I have shewed more fully in my Reply, pag. 37. 38.

12. But after these times of *Charles the Great*, mentioned in my Reply, pag. 18. you come next in your Reioynder, to your accu-

Aug. Epist.
50.

2. Cor. 13. 8.

accusation of Luther, & Calvine, mentioned in my Reply, p. 49. So that here you skip over no lesse then fifteen whole leaves together in that my Reply. Yet what have you now to say against Luther, and Calvine? In your first Answer, you tooke occasion, (for I gave you none,) to inveigh against them, as if they had beene Adversaries to Kings, and Princes, and to the obedience due to them. In that my Reply, pag 49. I said, that the works, and writings of them both did shew, & openly proclayme the contrarie to the world. And this is indeede, verie apparant: *Luth. tom. 1*
 For, whereas some objected, That the rule, or government of one in Gen. cap. 9
 man over another, might seeme, a tyrannous usurpation, because all *& tom. 3. an*
 men are naturallly of like condition: To this, (saith Luther,) must wee note. in Deu
 that have the word of God oppose the commaundement, and ordinance capit. 6. fol. 4
 of God, who hath put a sword into the hand of the Magistrate, whom *& fol. 552.*
 therefore the Apostle calleth, Gods Minister. Againe, hee saith: *Rom. 13. 1.*
 I grieve, and blush, and groane to see, how scornefully, our Emperours, *3. 4. 5. 6.*
 and Princes of Germanie, are abused by the Pope: whom hee leadeth, *Luth. tom. 2*
 and handleth, like brute beasts, both for spoile, and slaughter, at his resp. ad Am
 owne pleasure. This Poperie, (saith hee,) is lively described by S. Pe- brof. cather fe
 ter, 2. Pet. 2. where hee saith, They despise Rulers, or Governours: by *150. & 152*
 Rulers, signifying secular Princes. Now the Popish Cleargie, have by
 their owne authoritie, exempted themselves, from tributes, subiection,
 and all charges of the Common-weale, contrarie to the doctrine of Pe-
 ter, and Paul: Yea, so farre is the Pope, from acknowledging the sove-
 raigntie of Princes, over him, that hee will scarce admitte them to
 kisse his feete. Calvine, likewise, writeth thus. The Word of God, *Calvin. Instit*
 (saith hee,) teacheth us to obey all Princes, who are established in *lib. 4. cap. 2.*
 there thrones, be it by what meanes soever: Yea, though they doe no- *sect. 22.*
 thing lesse, then the office of Kings, yet must they bee obeyed, and
 though the King be never so wicked, and indeede, unworthy the name
 of a King, yet must subiects acknowledge the image of Divine power,
 in his publike authoritie, and, as touching obedience, they must reve-
 rence, and honour him, as well as if hee were the godlyest King in the
 world. Nebuchadnezzar was a mightie invader and subduer of other
 Nations: yet God saith by his Prophet, that he had given those lands,
 and countries unto him. *Ezech. 29. & Dan. 2.* Neyther would he have
 any rebellion, or resistance to be offered, but contrarywise commaunded
 obedience to be performed unto him. *Iere. 27.* And therefore we must
 never

never suffer these seditious conceits, to possesse our mindes, as to thinke
 an evil King must be so dealt withall, as hee deserveth, but we are di-
 rectly charged to obey the King, though he bee a savage Tyrant, and
 never so bad. Beza also speaketh in like sort. Private men, (amongst
 whom, I account inferiour Magistrates, in respect of their King,)
 have no other remedie, (saith hee,) against Tyrants, to whom they
 are subiect, but amendment of their lives, prayers, and teares: which
 God in his good time, will not despise. And if it so fall out, that wee
 cannot obey the commandement of the King, but that wee must offend
 God, the King of kings, Then must wee rather obey God, then man:
 Yet so, as that wee remember, that it is one thing, not to obey: and, an-
 other thing, to resist, and to betake ourselves to Armes, which wee
 may not doe. Againc hee saith: The impudencie of our Adversaries,
 is herein most notorious, that they who contrarie to the word of God,
 have openly subiected Kings, and kingdomes, to their authoritie, and
 be themselves the most rebellious sect under heaven yet dare notwith-
 standing to obiect the guilt of that crime unto us. These being the
 doctrines, and positions of Luther, Calvine, Beza, and other
 Protestants, concerning Kings, and kingdomes, let the equall
 Reader Iudge, what, and how great the wrong is, you doe
 unto them, and whether also, that is, or can possibly be true,
 which you write, both in your Answer, and, againe, in your Re-
 ioynder, namely, That Kings, and Princes may more confidently
 build the safetie of their persons, and estates upon the loyaltie, of their
 Catholicke subiects, then upon any Protestant subiects. Why, more
 confidently, I pray you: For, is this a good reason which you
 bring, (viz.) because, although Papists give the spirituall su-
 premacie, headship, and Monarchie, over the whole Church
 upon earth, unto the Pope, (which indeed, they should not do,
 inasmuch as it is a Regall right, and Prerogative, properly be-
 longing unto Christ Iesus,) yet doe they acknowledge in Kings,
 a supremacie in Temporall matters yea, this reason, (if you
 did well observe it,) maketh rather much against you: For, it
 sheweth that Papists bee revera, neyther so good Christians
 nor yet so good subiects, as Protestants bee. Not so good Chri-
 stians: because, They hold not the head CHRIST IESVS, (as
 S. Paul speaketh,) but have, without any warrant, or commis-
 sion from him erected to themselves, another head, Monarch,
 and

Beza confess.
ap. 3. sect. 43

ibidem.

Act. 17. 7.

Job. 18. 36.

Ephes. 1. 21.

2. 23.

Ephes. 4. 15.

6.

1. Cor. 1. 17.

8.

Colos. 2. 19.

and Spirituall King, namely the Pope of Rome: Not so good subjects because they acknowledge not, to belong unto Kings, an authoritie over persons Ecclesiasticall, and in causes also Ecclesiasticall, as well as Civill, and Temporall, as Protestants doe. For, whereas you say that the Protestant Subjects, doe take from the King, the Temporall supremacie, as well as the Spirituall, it is too lewd, and loud a slander. Yea what is there, that the Protestants doe more earnestly contend for, against the Pope, and against his partakers, then the Spirituall supremacie, or Spirituall kingdome, to be given to Christ Iesus? And the Civill, or Temporall supremacie over persons Ecclesiasticall, and in matters Ecclesiasticall, as well as Temporall, to be given unto Kings and Princes, within their Dominions? But because you yet further object against the Protestants, both rebellious doctrines, and rebellious practises, and affirme that many instances of this kinde may be reade in the Booke of dangerous Positions: For a cleere and full Answer to all that you have said, or rather Papists have, or can say, in that case, I referre you unto that Booke, which is called *An exact Discoverie of Romish Doctrine in the Case of Conspiracie & Rebellion*: and the Reply to him, that calleth himselfe, the *Moderate Answerer thereof*. In which Bookes so conjoynd in one Volume, you may reade, and see at large, a cleere justification of Luther, Calvins, Beza, and other Protestants in this point, and contrarywise the Papists, to be notoriously guiltie therein. And this you may also see further debated, and shewed in that Booke, which is called, *The true difference betweene Christian subiection, and unchristian Rebellion*: In the third part whereof, be refuted the Iesuites reasons, and authorities, which they alleadge for the Popes depriving of Princes, and the bearing of Armes by Subjects against their Soveraignes: and where the tyrannies, and injuries of Antichrist, seeking to exalt himselfe above Kings, and Princes, be further discovered and declared, &c. These things, I would not here thus farre have spoken of, had not you provoked me thereunto, not only by your first beginning, but by your continuance, & still stiffe-standing in these your needlesse comparisons, & calumniationes. But you proceed, & come next from p. 50. in my Reply, to p. 79. where, againe, you

skippe over fourteene leaves more together, in the same booke. In that pag. 79. It is true, that I said. That not onely those kings of England before mentioned, namely King William Rufus, King Henry the First, and King Henry the Second, and some others, thus contended, and opposed themselves against the Pope of Rome: But King William the Conqueror also, who was before all these, made the like Kingly opposition. For when Hildebrand, otherwise called Pope Gregory the Seventh, was bold to demand of this King, an Oath of fealtie, to bee made to him, as if the King were to hold the kingdome of him, as of his Sovereigne Lord: This King would by no meanes yeeld thereunto, but sent him a full negative Answer, writing thus unto him. *Fidelitatem facere nolui, nec volo, quia nec ego promisi, nec antecessores meos, antecessoribus tuis, id fecisse comperio. I neyther would doe, nor will doe fealtie, because I neyther promised it, nor doe I finde that any of my Predecessors have done it to any of your predecessors.* I have here recited, the whole, & entire sentence, & not produced onely a part of it, as you did, verie lamely, and imperfectly. And now what have you to say against it? First concerning that of King William the Conqueror, you answer not a word. And touching those particulars, which I had before alleadged, concerning the others Kings, namely concerning William Rufus, King Henry the First, and King Henry the Second, and other Kings of England, that contended, and opposed themselves against the Pope of Rome, his encroachments, and usurpations, your answer is verie idle and impertinent. For you answer, as if I had affirmed, that those Kings had utterly renounced, abolished, or put downe, the Popes supremacie in their times, whereas I affirmed onely, that they contended, and made opposition against him; which they might, and did doe, although they then made not an utter extirpation, and abolition of him, out of that their kingdome. And that they made opposition to him, I have shewed and proved in my Reply, pag. 75. 76. 78. 79. 80. And verie ignorant are you in the histories of England, if you know not so much: and verie perverse, if knowing so much you will not acknowledge it.

13. From thence you come to pag. 81. of my Reply, where I write thus: *But now what meaneth my adversarie to bee so ex-
treamely*

treamely audacious, as to denie the first foure Generall Councels, to have beene called by the Emperours: Here you say, I was pleased to salute you with that language, which better fitted an inconsiderative Iester, then a deliberate Iudge. Why? what is the language, or what are the words, which so much offend you? You afterward shew, namely, because I there used that terme of *extreamely audacious*? But what is it else, but *extreme audacitissime*, to denie as you then did, and still doe, so cleere, evident, and plaine a truth? For my part, the matter considered, I see not, but you might have thought, that I spake moderately, and temperately enough, whilst I spake in that sort, and gave you no worse language: For some others possibly would have said, that you had beene, therein, *extreamely*, and intolerably impudent. But you forget, as it seemeth, or care not to remember, what language or words, you here utter, concerning me, which I have more cause to take ill at your hands, then you have to bee offended, at those other words of mine. But to come to those foure Generall Councels: I affirmed them, (which you denied,) to have beene called by the Emperours. The first of them, is, *The first Generall Councell of Nyce*: That this was called by the Emperour, I proved in that my Reply, pag. 81. 82. by the testimonie of *Ruffinus, Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret, Sozomon, Zonaras, Nicephorus, Platina*, and by the *Synodall Epistle of the Nycene Fathers themselves*. And doth not hee then deserve to bee accounted, at least *extreamely audacious*, that will dare to denie this so manifest, and palpable truth, testified so abundantly, and by so many witnesses? But whilst among other witnesses for prooffe of this point, I produced *Ruffinus*, affirming, that *Constantine, apud urbem Nicæam, Episcopale Concilium convocavit; Called the Councell of Bishopstogether, at the Citie of Nyce*: You say, that I there used, a little wile, which amongst the vulgar sort will bee called Craft or Coulenage: because, say you, I omitted those wordes, *Ex sacerdotum sententia*: which bee in *Ruffinus*, and which words, if they had beene mentioned, would have declared, that the Emperour *Constantine* summoned or called the Councell of Nyce, by the advise, consent, or approbation of the Priests. Howbeit, first, it is not of necessitie, that the omission of those wordes, must in-

Ruffin. lib. 1. cap. 1.

*Ruffin. lib. 1.
cap. 1.*

ferre it to bee done, with a minde and purpose to defraude, deceive, and coufen, as you verie odiously suggest. Yea, secondly, to shew, that I did not craftily, or coufeningly, conceale, or omitte those wordes, for mine owne advantage, as you alledge, behold, you shall finde, in the verie next page, namely, pag. 82. that I doe expressely mention them, and doe directly affirme, out of the same *Ruffinus*, that this Councell of *Nyce*, was assembled, or called, *Ex sacerdotum sententia*, By the advise and consent of the Priests: and thereby I also proved, that it was not done by the advise & consent of the Bishop of *Rome* alone. Now then who is the wily, Craftie, and Coufening Companion, I hope the honest; and equall Reader will by this time easily discern, and judge. But thirdly, I did there further answer, (as I doe likewise here againe,) that it maketh nothing to the matter in question, at whose suite, or request, or by whose advise or consent, that Councell was summoned: For the question, was not, nor is, by whose perswasion or suite, or by whose advise, or consent, but by whose commanding authoritie, it was called. Now it is verie apparant, by those former testimonies, that it was called, and assembled, by the commandement, or commanding authoritie of the Emperour: which declareth infallibly, the supremacie, and authority, which the Emperour had in those dayes over all the Bishops, and even over the Bishop of *Rome* himselfe, aswell as over the rest, whilst hee might and did thus commaund, aswell the one as the other, to appeare in a Generall Councell. I also cited *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, and *Theodoret*, and their wordes, to prove likewise that the Emperour *Constantine*, called, and assembled that Generall Councell at *Nyce*: But you are pleased not to see, or not to acknowledge, where those wordes are to bee found in their Authors: And yet might you have seene and found them, (if you had so pleased,) in their severall Authors: as namely in *Eusebius de vita Constantini*, lib. 3. cap. 6. & lib. 1. cap. 37 in *Socrates*, lib. 1. cap. 8. in the Greeke, and cap. 5 in the Latin: and in *Theodoret*, lib. 1. cap. 7. So that even that also which I cited out of *Theodoret*, is not a famous fiction, (as you infamously and untruely report it,) but a verie certaine, & apparant truth, as there you may see. And all the rest of the Authors, which I there

there cited, doe likewise testifie, and prove the same thing for which I there alleadged them. Yea, this point is so cleere and evident, that whilst you thought to confute it, you have your selfe further confirmed, and confessed it. For when you, purposing to alleadge *Ruffinus* against mee, doe cite his wordes, thus: *Tumille, Then hee, (meaning Constantine,) ex sacerdotum sententia, apud urbem Nyceam, Episcopale concilium, convocavit: By the sentence, or consent of the Priests, did call the councill of Bishops, at the citie of Nyce: And when againe, you likewise intending to alleadge Damasus against me, doe affirme, that he saith: That Constantine, did not gather the councill, but cum consensu Silvestri, Damasus* *lib. 1. cap. 1.* *with the consent of Sylvester: and that so much also, is expressed in the sixth councill. Doe you not, in all this, sufficiently confesse, Pont. concil. 6. act. 18.* that the Emperour *Constantine*, did, by his commanding authoritie, call this councill of *Nyce*, although hee did it, by the consent, or approbation of *Sylvester* Bishop of *Rome*, and of other Priests: Now then to come to the second generall Councell, (which was the first *Constantinopolitane*,) I have likewise proved in my *Reply*, pag 83. by the testimonies of *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Zonaras*, and the verie Councell it selfe, speaking to the Emperour, *Theodosius the elder*, that it was called by the commaundment, or commaunding Authoritie of the same Emperour. To all which proofes, and testimonies, yon, (according to your wonted learning & wisdom,) answer nothing in your *Reioynder*. But, in your first answer, to prove this Councell, not to bee called by the commaundment of the Emperour, but of *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome*, you cited *Theodoret lib. 5. cap. 9.* and in your *Reioynder* you prosecute it, and say, *That the Bishops meeting in this second generall councill, writing to Pope Damasus doe testifie, that they assembled at Constantinople, by reason of his letter sent the yeare before to Theodosius.* But what meane you thus to abuse your Reader? For first there is no such thing in that place of *Theodoret*, that doth prove this second Generall Councell, to have beene any more called by *Damasus*, then by the other Bishops mentioned in the same Letter, or in the same Epistle. For, that Letter, or Epistle, was not written, or directed to one alone, as namely to *Damasus*, (as you would make men beleeve,) but to many and diverse

Theodor lib. 5 cap. 9.

Bishops plurally. For thus is the direction, (*viz.*) To our most honourable Lords, our verie Reverend brothers, and fellowes in Office, *Damasus, Ambrosius, Britton, Valerian, Achelius, Anemius, Basil*, and the rest of the holy Bishops assembled in the noble Citie of Rome. The holy Councell of Orthodoxe Bishops, gathered together in the great Citie of Constantinople, send Greeting. So that, it was not *Damasus* alone, (as here you see,) but the rest of those reverend Bishops also, assembled at Rome, that sent those Letters, mentioned in that Epistle to the most holy Emperour *Theodosius*. And secondly, even those Letters of *Damasus*, and of the rest of the Bishops, sent to the Emperour, concerning that matter of calling the Councell were onely perswasive, and not commaunding Letters: In as much as it is before, by my Reply, verie evident, that this Councell was assembled by the commaundement, or commaunding Letters of the Emperour. And consequently it was not *Damasus* alone, but other Bishops also joyned with him, that sent those their Letters to the Emperour, whereby hee was excited, moved, and perswaded, to call, and commaund that Councell to bee assembled at Constantinople. Now then, seeing that *Theodore* whom you cite to prove, that Pope *Damasus* by his commaunding Letters, called this Councell, proveth no such matter: Yea hee expressly witnesseth the contrarie, affirming it directly, to have beene called by the commaundement of the Emperour: Doth or can this any way helpe to excuse you? Or doth it not rather so much the more inlarge, and aggravate your fault herein?

*Theodor. l. b. 5
cap. 7.*

Concerning the third Generall Councell, (which was the first *Ephesine*.) that, That was called by the commaundement of the Emperour *Theodosius* the younger, I have also proved in in my Reply, pag. 83. by the testimonies of *Evagrius, Liberatus, Socrates, Zonaras, Nicephorus*, & by the Synodall Epistle it selfe. And yet you would make men beleieve, that it was called not by the commaundement of the Emperour, but of *Celestinus* Bishop of Rome. And for prooffe hereof, you cite *Prosper* in *Chronico*, affirming it to have beene held *Celestini auctoritate*. By the authority of *Celestine*. But you still much mistake, for this was no commaundement, or commaunding authoritie in *Celestinus*, but a perswasive onely, which Bishops might, and did use to the Emper-

Emperours, verie often, for the obtayning of Councils. So that by these wordes, is no more meant, or signified, but that *Celestinus* used such authoritie, that is, such power, credite, and estimation, as hee had with the Emperour, to cause, and procure this Council to bee assembled. And that this word, *Au- thoritas*, doth so signifie, and is verie often used in that sence, your *Dictionaries*, and *Latine* writers, will sufficiently teach you. Yea, your selfe, in your *Rejoynder*, doe cite *Paulus Dia- conus*, in his *Historicall collections*, that hee speaketh of the last of the first foure Generall Councils, (which was the Coun- cell of *Calcedon*;) in this sort. *Pape Leonis auctoritate, &c. By the* *Paul. Diac.*
authoritie of Pope Leo, and command of Martian the Emperour, *lib. 15.*
the Council of Calcedon was summoned. Here you see a plaine di-
 stinction, made betweene this *authoritie*, & the *command*. The
 command, or commanding authoritie, being attributed to the
 Emperour *Martian*: and the other authoritie, namely the per-
 swasive, being attributed to *Leo*, Bishop of *Rome*. And yet ney-
 ther, was it onely *Celestinus* Bishop of *Rome*, but other Patri-
 arkes, and Bishops, likewise, as namely *Cyrill* Bishop of *Alex- andria*, *Iohn* Bishop of *Antioch*, and *Iuvenall* Bishop of *Ierusalem* *Zonar. in*
 that perswaded, and excited the Emperour, to call and com- *Theodos. In-*
 maund, this third Generall Council at *Ephesus*, as *Zonaras* *more.*
 testifieth.

And as touching the fourth Generall Council, which was, as I said, that at *Calcedon*: I have proved in my *Reply*, pag. 85. by the testimonie of the verie Council it selfe, and by sundry Epistles also, of *Leo* Bishop of *Rome*, that this Council of *Calcedon*, was summoned by the commaundement of the Em- perour: whereunto may be also added, that your owne testi- monie of *Paulus Diaconus*, before cited, who saith, (as even your selfe alledged him,) that this fourth Generall Council of *Calcedon*, was summoned or called by the commaunde- ment of *Martian* the Emperour, and not of *Leo*, although *Leo* did also interpose and use his authoritie, and credite with the Emperour, for the effecting of it. Now then, when beside the cleerenesse of other proofes, you saw by this expresse testimo- nie of *Paulus Diaconus*, (whom your selfe alledged,) that this Council of *Calcedon*, was summoned, or called by the com- maunde-

maundement of the Emperor *Martian*, why should you, or any man else, say, or suppose the contrarie thereunto? Yea even *Leo* himselfe, in divers of his Epistles, sheweth. (as I said before,) that neyther hee, nor any other Bishop of *Rome* did, in those dayes, summon or call, cyther this, or any other Generall Councell, but that it belonged to the Emperours, so to doe, as you may see more fully, by the wordes and actions, of the same *Leo*, formerly mentioned in my Reply, pag. 84. 85. But I there also further alledged, a fifth Generall Councell, called, *Mandato Iustiniani*, By the commaundement of *Iustinian* the Emperour. And other Councells I likewise there alledged, called by Emperours: to all which, you answer nothing. Nor doe you answer to *Cardinall Cusanus*, there also produced by me, confessing, and affirming expressly, though it were against the Pope, that, *The first eight Generall councells, were called by the Emperours*. Yea, this is so cleere a case, and so evident a truth, that *S. Hierome* maketh it to bee of the essence of a Generall Councell: *Dic quis Imperator jusserit hanc Synodū convocari: Tell us*, (saith hee,) *what Emperour commaunded this councell so be assembled*: thereby declaring, that it was held for no Generall Councell in those dayes, unlesse it were called, and assembled by the commaundement of the Emperour. Now then, upon all these premisses, I leave it to the equall Reader, to judge, whether hee that denieth this so cleere, plaine, and palpable, a truth, be not justly worthy to bee accounted, at least, *Extreamely audacious*, if not extreamely impudent.

14. And yet you would seeme to say further, that *S. Peter* by his authoritie and commaundement, called the Councell which was at *Ierusalem*, in the Apostles times, (*Act. 15.*) and, that hee was also the President therein. But you prove it not, neyther is there any such thing in the Text appearing, that hee commaunded or called that Councell. Yea, hee had no such commaunding, or compulsive authoritie over the rest of the Apostles. The Greeke Scholiast saith, *That hee did nothing imperiously, or with commaunding authoritie, but all things by common consent*. And therefore, in those times of the Apostles, did that Councell at *Ierusalem*, (*Act. 15. 6.*) come together, and was assembled by common consent, and agreement amongst them.

*Hieron. lib. 2.
in Ruffin.*

*Gr. Schol. in
Act. 2.*

themselves: But afterward, indeede, in the succeeding times, when the Emperours became Christians, *The Ecclesiasticall affaires*, (saith *Socrates*,) did much depend upon them, so that the greatest Councils were in time past, and still are, (saith hee,) at this day, called by their appointment. Neyther was Peter, the first man, that spake in that Councell, (as you affirme, seeking thereby to prove him to bee also the President therein:) For the Text sheweth, that there had bene great disputation, before Peter rose up, and spake, *Act. 15. 7.* Yea, it seemeth, that James rather than Peter, was the President in that Councell: For James was he, that gave the definitive sentence, *Act. 15. 19. 20.* & to that sentence of his, did both Peter, and the rest of that Councell, consent, and condescend, and accordingly, was the decree drawne and made up, in that Councell, and sent unto the Churches, as appeareth, *Act. 15. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29.* Neyther is it true, that to Prelide, or to be President, in Councils, is a right properly belonging to the Pope, whatsoever you say: Yea, it is verie evidently, and abundantly disproved in Ecclesiasticall historie, by sundrie Councils, wherein others, and not the Bishops of Rome, were the Presidents. And *Athanasius* himselfe saith expressely, of *Hosius*, that hee was, in his time, *Conciliorum Princeps*, the chiefe, Prince, or President of the Councils.

Socrat. libr. 5. in Proemio.

Athanas. ad solitar. vitam agentes.

15. But in my Reply, pag. 30. I said further, that *Athanasius* did approve of the Authoritie of the Emperours, in Ecclesiasticall causes: and this I proved by two instances, and not by one onely, (as you say:) The first was this, that when *Athanasius* was commaunded to conferre, with one *Arius*, concerning matters of faith: hee answered: *Who is so farre out of his wits, that hee dare refuse the commandement of his Prince?* The other, was this. That the Emperours commaundement made him to appeare before the Councell of Tyrus: and finding that councell, not to be indifferent, but partially affected, Hee and the rest of the Orthodoxe Bishops, appealed to the Emperour. To the former you answer nothing at all, in your Rejoynder. To the latter, you speake somewhat, and doe say, that, *That which I call the councell of Tyrus, was no councell at all.* And this you would prove by the testimonie of *Athanasius* himselfe, where he saith thus. *Qua fronte, talem conventum, Synodum appellare audent, cui*

comes *Præfedit*, With what face dare they call such an assembly? a Synod, or Councell, in which the Count did *Præside*? But doe you thinke this, to be a reason sufficient, to prove it to be no councell at all, or in any sort, because a Count being a Lay-man did *Præside* in it, as Deputie, or Lieutenent to the Emperour, and in his stead? Doth not your selfe say in your *Rejoynder*, that the Emperour *Theodosius the Younger*, sent Count *Candidianus*, as his Lieutenent to the Councell of *Ephesus*? will you therefore conclude, that this Councell of *Ephesus*, was also therefore no Councell at all, because this Count *Candidianus*, being a lay-man, was President, or Lieutenent it it, in stead of the Emperour? For you may aswell conclude the one, as the other by that reason. Doe not therefore misconster nor mistake, that holy man *Athanasius*, nor wrong, nor delude your Reader by a fallacie, *à dicto secundum quid*, *ad dictum simpliciter*. For if you reade him diligently, and observantly, you will finde, that he denyed it not to bee a Councell, simply and absolutely, but in some respects; as, namely, in respect it consisted of *Arrian* Bishops, and of that *Arrian* President, and that, their plotte, purpose, and endeavour was to advance *Arrianisme*, against Gods truth, and the *Orthodoxe* Bishops of that time, and against the decrees of the former famous Councell of *Nyce*, in that point: and in respect also, that not justice, but violence, or tyranny was there intended, and such like. And this you might have perceived, if you had gone on, with the words of *Athanasius*, which are these, (viz.) *Qua fronte, talem conventum, Synodum appellare audent, cui Comes præsidet? Et ubi speculator apparebat? Et Comentarientis sive Carcerarius, pro Diaconis Ecclesie, adventantes introducebat? ubi Comes verba faciebat, ceteri presentes in silentio erant, vel potius Comiti obsequium suum, accommodabant, &c.* Againe he there saith. *Qua species ibi Synodi, ubi vel cædes, vel exilium, si Casari placuisset, constituebatur?* And againe hee saith. *Niceni Concilij Decreta irrita, sua autem, rata volunt: Et Synodi vocabulo uri audent, qui tanta Synodo non obtemperant: Nihil illis Synodi curæ sunt, sed inanem speciem Synodi prætexunt, ut sublati Orthodoxis viris, ea quæ veræ, & magnæ Synodi, de Arianis, statuta sunt, demoliantur.* And therefore hee saith further, thus *Quæ res cum ita agerentur, ab ijs tanquam è concilio injuriosam, recessimus. Quod enim libuit, fecere. That whilst these*

Athan. apolo.
a. pag. 567.

Ibid. p. 566.

Ibid. p. 619.

things were thus done, wee saith hee, departed from them, as from a Councell of injurious persons: For they did, what they listed: You see then in what respects it is, that *Athanasius* disliked, and condemned this Councell of *Tyrus*, as not worthy the name of a Councell: Yet, for all that, hee affirmed it not, to be no Councell at all simply and absolutely, and to all intents, and purposes, as you would perswade. For if it had been no Councell at all, or in any sort, why was it convoked or assembled, as a Councell? Or why was *Athanasius* commaunded by the Emperour to appeare there? Or why did the same *Athanasius* afterward appeale from thence to th' Emperour? yea even *Athanasius* himselfe, affirmeth it to be a councell, such a one as it was, & giveth it expressely, the name of a Councell, when he saith, as you heard before, that he, and the rest of the Orthodoxe Bishops departed from thence, *tanquam à Concilio iniuriosorum*, as from a Councell of injurious Persons. So that, a Councell himselfe here acknowledged it to bee, though a bad Councell, though a Councell of injurious, and wicked Persons, and a Councell not worthy to bee called a Councell, because it thus intended, and endeavored, the advancement of *Arrianisme*. But what? Will you say, that the many and fundrie Councels convoked, and assembled in times past, wherein *Arrianisme* was established, were therefore no Councels at all, or in any sort? Yea this of *Tyrus*, (as well as those,) was held to be a Councell, (though a wicked, and impious one,) not onely by *Athanasius*, but by *Socrates* also, and by *Theodoret* likewise, who in their severall Ecclesiasticall Histories, doe often call it expressely by that name, of the Councell of *Tyrus*. And even that Christian Emperour also, *Constantine* himselfe, wrote unto them, by the same name, calling them the Councell of *Tyrus*. And it is yet further recorded, that, by the Emperours commaundement, this Councell of *Tyrus*, (expressely againe so called,) was removed from *Tyrus*, to *Ierusalem*.

But then you say, that the fact, whereof *Athanasius* was accused by the *Arrians*, in that Councell of *Tyrus*, was a meere civill crime, belonging to the Temporall Tribunall: to wit, the killing of *Arsenius*, and cutting of his hand. But you are still deceived: For it was not onely the killing of *Arsenius*, and the

*Socrat. libr. 1.
c. 20. c. 21. ca.
22. Theodor.
lib. 1. c. 28. c.
29 c. 30. 31.*

Socrat. lib. 1.
cap. 20.

Theodoret. lib
1. cap. 30.

Athanas. apo-
log. 2. p. 568.

Socrat. lib. 1.
cap. 20.

cutting of his hand, (as you alledge,) but it was further, the using of that hand, (so suggested to bee cut of,) to *Magicke*, and *Sorcerie*, that was layd to his charge: Yea, fundrie other things also were layd to his charge, as namely, *that hee had deflowred a virgin: and that one of his Cleargie, had beaten downe the Altar, overthrowne the Lords Table, broken the holy Cuppe, and burned the blessed Bible.* For all which misdemeanours, his accusers sought to get him displaced, and deposed in that Councell. So that it was not a meere Civill crime, that was layd to his charge, as you suppose, but they were mixt offences, partly Civill, and Temporall, and partly Episcopall, and Ecclesiasticall. And therefore well might it bee called in some respect, *Negotium Imperatorium*, a matter Imperiall, namely in respect of the accusation of killing of *Arsenius*. and the cutting of his hand, if you goe no further but to consider these facts onely, singly and apart from the rest: For so also did the Emperour, *Constantine* himselfe, as it seemeth, for a while, conceive of it, and therefore wrote to *Dalmatius*, the Censor, that hee should call before him, such as were accused, heare the matter, and punish the offenders: But afterward hee altered his opinion, and stopped that course of hearing *Athanasius* matters before the Censor, and would have them to bee heard, and determined before the Councell of Bishops, which was assembled at *Tyrus*, (and which was afterward removed from thence to *Ierusalem*, to consecrate a Temple or Church, which the Emperour had builded there.) The Emperour, (saith *Socrates*,) willed the Bishops assembled at *Tyrus*, to debate, together with other matters, the contentions raysed about *Athanasius*, to the end, (all quarells being removed,) they might afterward cheerefully solemnize the consecration of that Church, and dedicate the same unto God. So that, all the matters layd to *Athanasius* his charge, being not singly and severally, but joyntly together considered, and they all tending, to the slander, defamation, and deposing of so worthy, reverend, and renowned a Bishop, it appeareth by the event, that it was at last, in those times, held, and concluded, to bee *Negotium Synodale, & Episcopale*, a matter meete for a Synode, or Councell of Bishops, to consider of, and to determine. And so indeede was it done accordingly. Now then,
when

when *Athanasius* went to the Emperour for refuge, appealing from this wicked, and injurious Councell of *Tyrus*, unto the same Emperour, in this his Episcopall, & Ecclesiasticall cause: Is it not thereby, verie evident, that hee approved of the authoritie of the Emperour in a cause Ecclesiasticall? But if yet, you make any doubt hereof, you may see further in my *Reply*, pag. 68. that as the Apostle *Paul* appealed to *Cesar*, so *Athanasius* himselfe saith, that by that example of the Apostle, hee would likewise appeale to the Emperour of his time: and hee saith there further, that beyond the Emperour, there was, in his dayes no appeale to be made to any, but to God onely, and consequently not to the Pope.

16. But you demaund of me certaine questions wherein you would be resolved: The first is, whether I hold, and conclude the spirituall supremacie to be in the King? I cannot but wonder at this question of yours. For I have often told you, in my *Reply*, that it is a Civill and Temporall supremacie, over persons Ecclesiasticall, and in causes also Ecclesiasticall, which I give unto Kings. What? have wee beene so long disputing about the point of Supremacie? And doe you not yet know the state of the question betwixt us? *S. Paul* speaketh of some, that would bee Doctors of the Law, and yet understand not what they speake, nor wherof they affirme: Of this sort, it seemeth, you are, by this question propounded. But I answered you once more, that it is not, (as you have often said, and often mistaken,) a spirituall, but a Civill, and Temporall supremacie, that I attribute to Emperours, Kings, and Princes, in causes Ecclesiasticall, and over Persons Ecclesiasticall. And as for the Spirituall supremacie, it belongeth rightly and properly to Christ Iesus, the onely Spirituall King, Head, and Monarch, of his whole Church. For when hee was demaunded, touching his kingdome, hee answered thus: *My kingdome is not of this world:* *Ioh. 18 36.* thereby declaring, that hee was not a worldly, or terrestriall King, but a spirituall King. And therefore also when they would have made him, a terrestriall King, hee would none of it, but refused, and departed from them. And so likewise testified *S. Paul*, his true, and faithfull Apostle, (speaking of himselfe, and of the rest of the Ecclesiasticall Ministers,) *that the*

1. Tim. 1. 6.

Ioh. 6. 15.

Cor. 10. 4. weapons of their warfare, are not carnall, but mightie through God: that is, they bee divine, and spirituall, and not worldly or terrestriall. And in respect of this his spirituall kingdome, or spirituall supremacie, all Emperours, Kings, Princes, and Potentates, aswell as all Bishops, and others, of what degree soever, must acknowledge their subjection unto him. For to him is given all power both in heaven and in earth. And hee it is, whom God hath set at his right hand, farre above all principalitie, and power, & might, and dominion, and everie name, that is named, not in this world onely, but also in that which is to come. And hee hath made all things subject, under his feete, and hath given him, over all things, to bee the head to the church, which is his body, the fulnesse of him that filleth all in all. And, Hee must raigne untill he hath put all his enemies under his feete. You see then, that this spirituall kingdome, or spirituall Monarchy and supremacie, belongeth onely to Christ Iesus, and not to any terrestriall Emperour, King, Prince, Pope, or Prelate whatsoever. And therefore when you attribute, (as you doe,) the spirituall supremacie to the Pope of Rome, consider well, how great & intolerable the offence is. For is it not (as I said before) direct high treason in a subject, to intrude, and usurpe upon the kingdome of his soveraigne, and to exercise his supremacie, Royall rights, authorities, and Prerogatives therein, without any warrant, or commission from him? And is it then any lesse then high treason, for the Bishop of Rome to doe the same, in the spirituall kingdome of CHRIST IESVS? If you say that the Bishop of Rome, is but onely the *Vicar*, or *Vice-roy*, or *Deputie*, unto Christ, in that his kingdome: I demaund who constituted, or appointed him to bee so? For is not he still a traytor to his King, that entreth upon his kingdome, possesseth, and enjoyeth it, under colour, and pretence, that hee is appointed by his soveraigne, to bee the *Vice-roy*, or *Lord deputie* of the kingdome, when *revera.* (whatsoever he pretendeth, hee neyther hath, nor can shew any Letters-Patents, Warrant, or Commission from his King for the same? Such is the case of the Bishop of Rome. For neyther the Pope, nor all his partakers, doe, or be able to shew any warrant or commission from Christ, in that behalfe: They have beene long seeking out such a warrant and commission, but they could

could never yet, nor ever will be able to finde it. If then this be high treason against Christ, in the Pope: do your selfe judge what offence it is in you, or others; that take part with him therein, and bee his adherents, followers, and maintayners. The second question you demaund of mee, is, whether the whole Church being but one, there be any more heads of it then one? I answer, that the whole Church, being (as S. Paul calleth it.) *The body of Christ; This one body*, can have no more then one head: and, *that one head is CHRIST IESVS*, as the same S. Paul, againe expressely teacheth and affirmeth. And therefore, this head, is not the Pope of Rome, as you verie strangely dreame your selfe incline to this, that there should be but *one Head to this one Body*. How then can you admit any more heads unto it, then this one, which is Christ Iesus? For, if you make CHRIST IESVS to be one head, and the Pope to be another head, you make this one body to have two heads, and so make it a Monster. As for your distinction, of a *Vital head*, and a *Ministeriall head*, it is before removed and taken away in my first Booke, pag 94. 95. 96. 97. whereto you have not answered. And whereas you say, that the Church Militant, consisting both of *Jewes*, and *Gentiles*, is but *Unum ovile*, *One sheepefold*, and that this one *Sheepefold*, there is but *unus Pastor*, *one pastor*, or *one sheepeheard*, it is true: but this *unus pastor*, *one sheepeheard*, is not, (as you still fondly fancie,) the Bishop of Rome, but CHRIST IESVS onely, as appeareth in the same Chapter. And in this respect, he is also called, *Magnus pastor ovium*, *The great sheepeheard of the Sheepe*. Yea, the chiefe, or supreme Pastor, over all the severall Pastors of all the severall flocks in the world. For thus S. Peter speaketh to them all: *Feede the flocke of God, which dependeth upon you, caring for it not by constraint, but willingly: not for filthy lucre, of a ready minde: not as though yee were Lords over Gods heritage, but that yee may be examples to the flocke: And when the chiefe Sheepeheard shall appeare, yee shall receive an incorruptible crowne of glory*. Here you see, that S. Peter sheweth very plainly that not himselfe, (though hee were an Apostle,) much lesse the Bishop of Rome, or any other Bishop, was to have this high and transcendent name of Chiefe or supreme Pastor, over all

the

1. Cor. 12. 12.
13. 14. 56.
Ephes. 1. 22
23.
Ephes. 4. 15.
Coloss. 1. 8.
Coloss. 2. 10.

Ioh. 10. 16.

Ioh. 10. 11.
14.

Heb. 13. 20.

1. Pet. 5. 23
4.

the rest of the severall Pastors: For to CHRIST IESVS onely hee attributeth, and appropriateth this tittle, as being his peculiar and prerogative: in asmuch as it is Christ Iesus onely, and not the Bishop of Rome, nor any other man mortall whosoever that can give this incorruptible crowne of glorie he there speaketh of. Not the Pope then, nor any other, but CHRIST IESVS onely, appeareth to bee the chiefe or supreme Pastor, or (which commeth all to one reckoning,) the Vniversall Bishop, over all the severall Bishops, and severall Pastors, dispersed in the world. Your owne translation in this Text of 1. Pet. 5. 4. is, *Princeps Pastorum, the Prince of Pastors*: which likewise still sheweth, that not the Pope, but CHRIST IESVS onely, is the supreme Pastor, or the Prince of the severall Pastors dispersed on the face of the Earth. And therefore was it also decreed in the Councell of Carthage 3. ca. 26. that *Prime sedis Episcopus, non appelletur Princeps sacerdotum, vel summus sacerdos, aut aliquid huiusmodi sed tantum primæ sedis Episcopus*: The Bishop of the first Sea, may not bee called, the Prince of Priests, or the cheefe Priest, or any such like, but onely Bishop of the first Sea. And Gratian addeth further as touching the title of Vniversall Bishop, Neyther let the Bishop of Rome be so called. Now then to come to answere you, also touching Nero, and other Heathen, & persecuting Emperours, and Kings: It is true, that they have the same Civill sword, power, and authoritie committed to them from God, which the Christian Emperours, and the Christian Kings have, and to the same end; namely, for the punishment of evill doers, and for the prayse of them that doe well: But if they punish good, and godly men, and well-doers, (as Nero did, when hee put S. Peter, and S. Paul, to death, and as the other Emperours, and Kings doe, which persecute the true and Orthodoxe Christians) This is not the right using, but abusing of the sword and authoritie, committed to them. So that, the power, and authoritie is the same to both: but the difference is in the use, or abuse of that Authoritie. All the supremacie, power, and authoritie graunted from God, to any Emperours, Kings, and Princes, within their Dominions, ought to be imployed for God, and not against him, in any sort. And according hereunto, the true Christian Emperours,

Distinct. 99.
prim. sed.

1. Pet. 2. 13.

14.

Rom. 13. 3. 4

Emperours, and Kings, use their Civill swords, and authorities for God, and for advancement of his service, truth, and religion. And although Heathen, and Infidell Emperours and Kings doe commonly abuse that sword, and authoritie, (which God hath given them,) against God, and against his service, servants, and religion. Yet if any Heathen Emperour, or King doe commaund any thing for God, or for his service, worship, or religion, (as they may doe, and sometimes have done,) (as appeareth by the examples of King Cyrus, King Darius, King Artaxerxes, King Nabuchadnezzar, and others:) therein, they are no lesse to bee obeyed, then if it had beene commaunded, by the godlyest, & best professed Christian King in the world. And this you may see further declared, in my first Booke, Chap. 1. pag. 7. and in my Reply, pag. 44. 45. Wherefore, it is evident, that even Pagan and Heathen Kings, have the same supremacie, power, and authoritie, within their Kingdomes and Dominions, to commaund for God, his service, & religion, which Christian Kings and Princes have: although, they doe not, (as they should,) evermore use, extend, and imploy, that their power, and authoritie, accordingly, for God, and his religion: and consequently, the defect, is not in respect, of any power, or authoritie, (which they want not,) but in respect of their understandings, wils, and affections, which being depraved, and corrupted, and not rectified or sanctified, nor converted to Christ, and Christianitie, doe carrie them awry, and the wrong way.

But you propound unto mee, yet further, another question, which is this. What if the King of Slavonia, or any other king misled by frailtie, ignorance, or malice, should imploy their powers to force their subjectes from the true Religion, and thereby subvert, and ruinate, not onely their owne soules, but the soules of their subjects also: Might not the King in this case, being, (as you call him,) a scabbed sheepe, (all other meanes fayling of his recoverie,) be compelled by the Bishop of Rome, to embrace Gods true faith and religion, and to permitte the same freedome unto his subjects? I answer, no. For, first, what right, or authoritie, from God, hath the Bishop of Rome in this case, to compell Kings, and Princes, more then

Ezra 1. 2. 3.

&c.

Ezra, 6. 1. 2.

3 &c.

Ezra 7. 12.

13. 14. 15.

16. 17. 18.

&c.

Dan. 3. 23.

29.

Dan. 6. 24.

25. 26.

other Bishops, have? Yea, neyther the Bishop of Rome, nor any other Bishop, or Ecclesiasticall Minister, hath any such power, or authoritie, included, or comprised, within those their Ecclesiasticall callings and Ministeries, as by worldly power, and externall force of Armes, to compell a King to the right religion. It is true, that the Ministers of Christ may exhort, & perswade the best they can, a King erring in his Religion, from his error, and may doe, what their Ecclesiasticall commission graunted them from Christ, will warrant them to doe, but no further may they goe: for then doe they, *Fines alienos invadere, Invade other mens bounds*, (S. Bernard speaketh,) as kings have

Rom 13. 4

the temporall sword, to commaund, and to compell: Bishops, Pastors and Ministers Ecclesiasticall, have not that but another sword

Ephes. 6. 17.

to use, namely, a spirituall sword, or sword of the spirit, which is the word of God: as S. Paul calleth & defineth it. And therefore these two swords must bee distinguished, and not confounded.

Luke. 12. 13

Yea, Christ Iesus himselfe, whilst hee was here upon earth, would not meddle with worldly, or temporall matters. For when one spake unto him, desiring him, to bid his brother, to

14.

Math. 16. 19

devide the inheritance with him, hee refused, and said: Man, who made mee to be a Iudge, or a devider over you? If you object, that

Mark. 18. 18

Christ said to Peter: Whatsoever thou bindest on earth, shalbe bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou loosest on earth shalbe loosed in heaven. Remember, that hee spake also the same thing plurally to all the Apostles, giving to them all alike the same autho-

ritie, saying thus *Quicquid ligaveritis, &c. Whatsoever yee binde on earth, shalbe bound in heaven: and whatsoever yee loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven*. You cannot therefore by vertue of those

wordes, inferre, that Peter, or his successors had any more authoritie, to depose Kings, or to compell them in any sort, to the

right religion, or to any thing else, then cyther James, or Iohn, or the rest of the Apostles, or any of their successors had, in the

like case; For, the same authoritie, and in the same wordes, is, (as you see,) graunted aswell to the one, as to the other. Ney-

ther againe, must you forget or omit the former part of those wordes spoken by CHRIST unto Peter, which bee these:

Mat. 16. 19.

I will give unto thee the keyes of the kingdome of heaven. For the subsequent wordes, (spoken to him,) of binding, and loosing,

have

have reference thereunto and : are therefore to bee expounded, not of things earthly, or concerning terrestiall matters, or worldly kingdomes, but of things concerning another world and kingdome, namely, concerning the kingdome of heaven.

And so also doth S. Bernard directly declare, saying thus, to

Eugenius Bishop of Rome: Ergo in criminibus, non in possessionibus, Bernard de potestas vestra: Quoniam propter illa, non propter has, accepistis cla- *considerat. ad vos regni celorum. Your power, (saith hee,) concerneth sinnes, and Eugen. lib. 2,*

not matters of possession: because, for those, and not for these yee have received the keyes of the kingdome of heaven. Yea, that the keyes

of the kingdome of heaven were also graunted equally and alike, to all the Apostles, I have further shewed, very fully, and

plainely, in my first Booke, pag. 292. 293. 294. &c. And that

no part of the power of those keyes, no, not Excommunication it selfe, (were it never so justly, or lawfully awarded,) is of any

force, by Gods law and institution, to depose Kings, or to dis-

annull the ducie & allegiance of subjects, I have likewise shew-

ed in the same my first Booke, pag. 299. 300. 301. By what

right, or reason then, shall or can the Bishop of Rome, (who

is also reverend no Minister of Christ at all, but the very apparant

grand Antichrist, (as I have proved at large, throughout the

third part of my first Booke,) clayme to have any such exter-

nall power coactive, or compulsive over Kings? But moreover

this question here propounded by you was sufficiently answered,

and resolved before, by S. Chrysostome, in the case of king

Vzziah, otherwise called Ozias, where hee putteth this difference

betweene the King, and the Priest; that Ille cogit, hic ex-

hortatur: Ille habet arma sensibilia, hic arma spiritualia. The King

compelleth, the Priest exhorteth: the King hath the sensible weapons:

the Priest, the spirituall weapons. And when the Priest, or Eccle-

Ch ysto. de
verbis Esaie,
vidi Dominu
bonil. 4.

Prov 21.1.

Chryf. de Sa-
cerdotio lib. 2

sheepheard doth his sheepe: for it is free for a sheepheard forcibly to blinde his sheepe, to drive them from their feeding, to seare them, and to cut them: but in the other case, the facilitie of the cure, consisteth not in him that giveth, but onely in him, that taketh the medicine. This, that admirable teacher perceiving, said to the Corinthians: Not that wee have any Dominion over you: under the name of faith, but that wee are helpers of your ioy. For of all men, Christian Bishops must not correct the faults of offenders by force or violence. Externall Iudges, when they take any transgressing the lawes, they shew themselves to be endued with great authoritie, and power, and doe compell them, whether they will or no, to change their manners: But here, (saith hee,) non vim afferre, sed suadere tantum oportet, atque hac ratione meliorem efficere, quem emendandum suscepis: You may not use violence but perswasion onely, and by this meanes, make him better, whom you have taken upon you to amend. Againe hee saith: If any sheepe goe out of the right way, and leaving the plentifull pastures, graze on barren, and steepe places: The sheepheard somewhat exalteth his voyce, to reduce the dispersed and stragling sheepe, and to force them to the flocke: But if any man wander from the right path of the Christian faith: The Pastor must use great great paines, care, and patience: Neque enim vis illi inferenda, neque terrore ille cogendus, verum suadendus tantum, ut de integro, ad veritatem redeat. For hee may nor be forced, or constrained with terror, but perswaded onely, that so hee may returne againe to the truth. If then your late Councell of Lateran, under Pope Innocentius the third, decreed, (as you say,) this externall power coactive, to bee in the Bishop of Rome: You see, it is not to be regarded: Because such a decree, (if any such were,) is directly contrarie to the testimonie of all former approved antiquitie. But yet you must also remember what Platina writeth concerning that Councell. *Veneranda multa tum quidem in consultationem, nec decerni tamen quicquam aperte potuit: Many things, (saith hee,) came into consultation, in that Councell, but nothing could plainly be decided: by reason, the Pope departing, to compose some tumults, then suddainely risen, died by the way. So that, this your great Councell of Lateran, consulting how to defeate Kings and Princes, of their Temporall kingdoms and Dominions, but not decreeing, or concluding any thing therein, as being prevented by the Popes hastened and*

Chrysost. de
Sacerdotio lib.
2.

Platina de
vita Innocen.

3.

unexpected death, will also doe you no pleasure, in this case: But now, why may not I, after so many questions of yours answered, propound you also one question? which is this. What if the Bishop of Rome, for maintenaunce of his worldly pompe, pride, pleasure, and ambition, carelesly neglect all right religion, and bee so extremely wicked, both for life, & doctrine, as that hee careth not to carrie innumerable soules, together with his owne, by heapes, to hell: who shall correct, restraime, repress, or punish him? For answer whereunto, you might say, that in former, and auncient times, The Emperours had the correction, and the punishment, aswell of the Bishops of Rome, as of other Bishops, that were offenders, within their Dominions: But now the case is altered, and the world turned topsie turvie, and the Bishop of Rome growne to that height, and licentiousnesse, as that hee will not allow himselfe to be censured, or judged by any men mortall, be they Emperours, Kings, Princes, Bishops, Generall Councils, or whosoever they bee. But whilst he is thus mounted, not onely above other Kings, and Princes, but even above the Emperours also himselfe. What saith Optatus of such a one? *Cum super Imperatorem non sit, nisi solus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem: certè qui se super Imperatorem extollit, iam quasi hominum excesserit metas, se ut Deum non hominem, aestimat: Forasmuch as, (saith he,) there is none above the Emperour, but God onely, that made the Emperour: Certainly, be that exalteth himselfe above the Emperour, as one that hath gone beyond the bounds of men, esteemeth himselfe, not now any longer as a man, but as God. And whilst withall, hee thus exempteth himselfe, from the Lawes, censure, and judgement of all men upon earth: what doth hee else, by all this, but shew himselfe to be, ὁ ἀνομος, That lawlesse person, mentioned by S. Paul, in 2. Thess. 2. 8. And which also sitteth in the Church, or temple of God, as God, and is exalted above all those men upon earth, that be called Gods in the Scriptures, (of which sort be Kings, and Princes,) and even above the Emperour also himselfe, to whom belongeth that ὁ βασιλεὺς σεβασμα, (mentioned in the same place of, 2. Thessal. 2. 4.) in asmuch as hee is, ὁ βασιλεὺς σεβαστος, that is, Augustus, as the Scripture also it selfe expressly calleth him, Act. 25. 21. 25. But lastly, It is well knowne that by Gods owne institu-*

Optat. libr. 3
pag. 85.

2. Thess. 2. 3
4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9
10. 11. 12.

om. 13. 1. 2
4. 5. 6.

tion, the power of the Civill and Temporall sword, rightly, & properly belongeth to Emperours, Kings, and Princes, and not to Bishops, Pastors, or other Ecclesiasticall Ministers: & therefore may Kings and Princes lawfully commaund, compell, and punish all Bishops, Pastors, and Ecclesiasticall Ministers whatsoever, (if they offend,) aswell as lay-Persons, by authoritie of that their sword, committed to them from God: But Bishops on the other side may not by that their Ecclesiasticall office and function use that temporall sword, nor any temporall externall power ceactive thereunto incident or belonging, against any King, or other Person, for any cause whatsoever: because that sword is not committed to them from God: Yea, this opinion concerning compelling of Kings, savoureth more of treason, then of reason, and therefore is utterly to bee detested, and abhorred.

Thess. 2. 3.
5. 6. 7. 8. 9.
O. 11. 12.
Rev. 17. 1. 2.
4. 5. 6.
Revel. 18. 4.

17. But then you say further, that whatsoever I alledged to invest our King with the supremacie, the same might be alledged by any Iudge in Spaine, or Hungarie, or other kingdoms, to prove the supremacie, to bee likewise in their kings. And why not? For it is a thing of right, belonging to all Kings, to have the supremacie within their severall Dominions, and to use, and extend that their power and authoritie, for God, and for the advancement of his true service, and right religion, aswell as for the advancement of Civill Justice, and externall peace, amongst their subjects. And what hurt were it to any, if all the Kings in Christendome, yea if all the kings in the world did this? or rather how great, ample & unspeakable a benefite, would thereby accrew and come, not onely to all Christendome, but to the whole world? If all the Kings in Christendome, or in the whole world, did extend their authoritie, for the maintenance, and advancement of Popery, (which is indeede, the adulterate, corrupt, and false Religion,) it being, (as the hoily Scripture it selfe hath notified and declared it to be,) the Religion of the grand Antichrist, and of the whore of Babylon, which all Gods people be commaunded to forsake,) even Papists themselves, out of the error of their judgement, would thinke it to bee well done: How much more, in true judgement, ought you, and they, to thinke it to be

be well done, if they did all imploy their Civill sword, power, and authoritie, for the advancement of that, which is indeed, the most auncient, true, Christian, Catholicke, and Apostolicke Religion?

But you have yet still a conceite, that it is requisite, & necessarie, to have a Pope of *Rome*, as a supreme Pastor, or a supreme Iudge, to decide, and determine all heresies, errors, doubts, questions, and controversies concerning faith, and religion, that arise in the Church, and so to preserve peace and unitie in it, by his infallible, and unerrable judgement. Howbeit, first, why should the Bishop of *Rome*, be this supreme Pastor, or supreme Iudge, more then the Bishop of *Antioch*, *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Ierusalem*, or any other Bishop? For where hath God constituted the one to bee so, more then the other? Secondly, how doe you prove the Bishop of *Rome*, to have an infallible & an unerrable judgement, more then other Bishops have? Yea even in the Preface of my first Booke, pag. 14. 15. 16. and againe in the second part of that same my first Booke, Chap. 1. pag. 54. 55. I have proved, that the Bishop of *Rome* may erre, even in matters of faith, as well as any other Bishop: and the same doth also before appeare in this Booke likewise. Thirdly, if the supremacie, and Monarchie of the Bishop of *Rome*, have this vertue in it, to keepe and maintayne peace and unitie in the Church, and to decide, and determine certainly, truly, and infallibly, all doubts, questions, and controversies in Religion: Why doth hee not decide and determine all those questions & controversies, that so it might experimentally appeare, to have that vertue in it: or what neede is there then, of Generall Councils, yea of any Councils at all? For, the use, and end of Synods and Councils, is to decide, and determine questions, and controversies, that doe arise, and spread themselves, to the disquiet, and trouble of the Church: all which, bee superfluous, if the certaine truth in everie question, may be had, immediately, from his mouth. But in deede this institution of Synods, or Councils, is a divine institution, and therefore must stand: although, that humane invention of the Popes supremacie, needelesly erected for the same use, and end, doe utterly fall, and be disannulled. And
what

what necessitie is there of him. For even Generall Connells, were summoned, and convocated in times past by the Emperours : and may be still at this day convocated, by the unanimous consent, and authoritie, of the severall Kings, and Princes, of the severall Nations. Neyther is the judgement of one man, (as namely of the Bishop of Rome, or of any other ,) so strong, or powerfull, to pull out errors, that be rooted in mens mindes, as is the judgement, and consent of many in a Synod or Councell : *Unlesse there be any, that thinketh, God inspireth one particular person with righteousness, & forsaketh a number of priests, assembled together in a Councell :* which, the Councell of *Africa*, held to be verie absurd, and repugnant to Christ his promise, so long as they meete together, in his name, and for advancement of his truth. And here you may observe a difference, betweene the *wisedome of God*, and the *wisedome of Men*: For, in the Apostles times, there arose at *Antioch*, a great question, which was, whether Circumcision were necessarie to salvation : what doe they in this case ? Doe they choose, and appoint some one man as chiefe, to whom they will referre the deciding, and determining of this question ? No such matter. And yet if they would have had the controversie decided, and determined by *One*: who was fitter to have beene that one, then *S. Paul*, whom they had amongst them ? But they take no such course, but send *Paul*, and *Barnabas*, and certaine others to *Ierusalem*. What to doe? Was it to desire the judgement onely of some one man there, as namely of *S. Peter*, or of any one other ? No. But to have the matter decided, by a Synod or Councell, of the Apostles, Elders, and others, therein to be assembled, for that purpose : and in which Synod, or Councell, it was determined accordingly. If then, in thosetimes of the Apostles, when there was so great abundance of the gifts of God, and when as controversies, might without danger of error, have beene referred unto one onely, The rule of *One* above all the rest, was not held meete, and convenient : Now when the gifts are lesse, and the danger of error more, Can it be thought a wisedome consonant to the *wisedome of the holy Ghost*, to erect, and constitute, (as the seduced world hath done,) *One man*, namely, the *Bishop*, or *Pope* of *Rome*, to be the Iudge,

Conc. *Affric.*
ap. 138. epist
d Celestinu.

Act. 15 1. 2
4 5. 6. 7. 8.
10. 11. 12
3. &c.

Judge, and that a verie sure, and infallible one, (as they account him,) for the deciding and determining of all doubts, questions, and controversies, that arise, throughout the whole world, concerning Faith and Religion, and upon whom, as being, (in their opinions,) the Monarch, and head of the whole, and universall Church upon Earth, they doe, (though overboldly, and dangerously,) relye, and depend? It is true, that the regiment or government of the Church is *Monarchiall*: but that is not in respect of the Pope, but in respect of CHRIST IESVS, who is, indeede, the right, true, and sole Monarch, and head of his whole Church: But in respect of the Bishops and Pastors, that be rulers, or governours under Christ, it is, (as the Protestants have rightly taught, and defended against the Papists, not *Monarchiall*, but *Aristocraticall*. Yea, Christ Iesus himselfe; told his Apostles, (and, in them, all Bishops, their successors,) when they contended for a Majoritie, or Monarchy among themselves: that *Reges gentium dominantur his: vos autem non sic*: The kings of Nations beare dominion over them, but yee may not doe so, one over another. For, of this was the question, or contention: and therefore of this must the answer bee accordingly understood. These words then doe cleerely declare, that there should bee no Ecclesiasticall King, or Ecclesiasticall Monarch amongst them, to rule, or raigne over all the rest: although terrestriall Kings and Monarches did, and are well allowed to raigne and rule over the people of those Nations, whereof they be Kings. But againe, hath not S. Gregorie himselfe told us long agoe, not onely how needelesse and superfluous, but how pernicious also and dangerous it was to the whole Church, to admitte of one to bee an universall Bishop, or an Ecclesiasticall Monarch, to rule, and raigne over all the rest? For then, (saith he,) if hee which is the Ecclesiasticall Monarch, or the universall Bishop, doe fall, the whole and universall Church falleth with him. And what Gregory thus spake, and as it were prophecied so long since, was afterward found true and came to passe accordingly, to the lamentable woe of the whole Church, in the succeeding times, by that meanes. Yea the same S. Gregory hath yet further certified us how pernicious, and dangerous this was, and would bee, not

Luke 22.24
25.26.

ΤΙς αὐτῶν
μειζων.
*Quis eorum
Maior.*

Gregorie.

Greg. y.

onely to the whole Church, but even to himselfe also, that would take upon him, to be the Ecclesiasticall Monarch, or supreme and universall Bishop over all. For, (saith hee,) what wilt thou answer unto Christ, who is the true head of the universall Church, in that day of iudgement, when by this name of universall Bishop, thou seekest to subjugate, all the members of his Body unto thy selfe? Whom dost thou imitate herein, save onely him, who in contempt of these legions of Angels, which were his fellows, sought to mount aloft to the top of singularitie, where hee might bee subiect to none, and all others might be subiect unto him. As for the having of Bishops of Dioceses, and Provinces, it no more proveth that therefore there may or must be one universall Bishop, or Ecclesiasticall Monarch over all: then that, because there be divers Kings in divers and severall Kingdomes, therefore there should be one universall King over all the Kings and kingdoms in the world. And besides, there were Bishops of Dioceses, and Provinces in the times both of Pelagius, and Gregorie, Bishops of Rome, whom neverthelesse they tooke no exception against, nor disallowed: But him that would take upon him to be an Ecclesiasticall Monarch, or a supreme and universall Bishop over the whole Church, him they would not endure, but vehemently impugned and detested him, and that not without verie apparant, just, and good cause, as here you see. But, moreover, did you never reade Iohn Gerson de Auseribiliate Papa. What he affirmed in some cases, may generally and absolutely be affirmed: namely, That the Pope may bee utterly abolished, and taken cleane away, & that without any losse or hurt at all to Christendome, yea to the great, and ample good, not onely of Christendome, but of all the world beside, if the matter be well weighed and rightly and thoroughly considered.

18. But touching this point of supremacie, you seeme at last, in words, to appeale to the judgement of the Primitive Church: I would you would doe as you say, and stand to the judgement of it, in verie deede. For I have proved, (which you have not disproved, nor ever will bee able to disprove,) That for the space of eight hundred yeares, and more, after Christ, even the Bishops of Rome themselves, aswell as other Bishops

Bishops were subject to the Emperours. And that the Christian Emperours, had also authoritie in matters Ecclesiasticall, aswell as Civill and temporall, within their Dominions: and nothing doe you, or can you alledge against it, but what hath beene many and sundrie times sufficiently, & abundantly answered, & confuted by the Protestants. As for that Catalogue of Emperours, Kings, and Princes, which you affirme to have beene exemplarily punished in this world by violent, and miserable deaths, for oppugning and striving against the Monarchie and supremacie of the Bishop of Rome, you onely say, & suppose it, but doe not prove it. And it is an overbold part in you, to enter into Gods secret counsels, and to affirme that to be the cause which you know not, nor be able to prove. For there might be, and so no doubt there were other just causes of their punishments. As for the oppugning of the Popes supremacie that could not be the cause of those or of any other punishments: in as much as the grosse wrongs, and utter unlawfulnessse of it, hath before plentifully appeared: and that neyther the Pope, nor all his partakers, be able to shew, any commission or warrant from God for the approbation of it. Yea, how could the oppugning or contending against the Popes Monarchie and supremacie, be any cause of punishment, when in the holy Scripures themselves it appeareth, (as in my first Booke I have shewed at large,) that *Papall Rome* is the *whore of Babylon*, and that the Pope of Rome, the head, and ruler of that adulterate, and Popish Church, is the verie grand *Antichrist*? Doe not therefore deceive your selfe, nor others any longer, by mistaking the cause, which is, you know, a fallacie, *a causa non, ut causa*.

Yet you further say, that I am argued by the wisest, in this Enterprize to have discovered in consideratively, much arrogancie of witt, in not well weighing the mayne importance of this difficultie, farre surmounting the talent of a Lawyer. But first, there is no such difficultie in it, as you speake of: and this I have formerly declared. Secondly, why doth it surmount, or exceede a Lawyers talent and ability, more in mee, then in you? Wherefore, if I bee, as you say I am,) censured, or argued, by the wisest, of much arro-

Reges Gentium dominantur.

gancie, because being a Lawyer, I meddle in this matter: Must not those wisest, in all justice, and equitie condemne you likewise, of much arrogancie, for the same cause? For you have hitherto in your writings, affirmed your selfe to be a Lawyer: & if all this while you nevertheless be not a Lawyer, you have done your selfe a great deale of discredite and dishonour in affirming it: Neyther can any man then tell, how to beleewe you, in any thing you speake, or write: So that herein you gull not mee, but your selfe, and others. It would therefore best become you, to unmaske your selfe, and to discover your selfe plainly: For you must thinke, howsoever you would conceale your selfe, that you are sufficiently knowne, and goe not invisible. But thirdly, who are those, whom you call and account, the wisest? For there bee some that be wise in their owne conceite: and some that be Antichristianly wise, and some that bee worldly wise: whose wisdom is, as *S. Paul* affirmeth it, *foolishnesse with God*. For, *hath not God*, (saith hee,) *made the wisdom of this world, foolishnesse?* The world accounteth the wisdom of God to bee foolishnesse. But, hee saith, *that the foolishnesse of God, is wiser then men: and the weakenesse of God, stronger then men*. The wisest men, then, doubtlesse bee those, that humbly submit all their learning, and wisdom, to *Gods* word, and wisdom, and that bee divinely, and Christianly wise: as for the rest, they must, (as the same *S. Paul* teaceth them,) *become fooles, that they may bee wise*. Whatsoever therefore you say: I beleewe, that which Christ Iesus himselfe hath spoken, to bee true, and that it will ever bee found verified, (*videlicet,*) *That wisdom is iustified of all her Children*. But lastly, what arrogancie eyther of wit, or learning, doe I shew, or discover, when I neyther brag nor boast of eyther: and when I further, franckly and freely confesse in all my Bookes, that such matter, as is therein containned, I have learned of others, and so attribute nothing to my selfe? The wit, and learning I have, how small, slender, or meane soever you, or others, esteeme it, I thanke God for it: and doe humbly pray him, to give mee the Grace, to use, and imploy it to his honour, and glorie, and not to mine owne. Yea, how weake or meane soever it bee, in respect of

of it selfe, yet such it hath appeared to be by the helpe and blessing of God, (to whom therefore I give all the thankes and the glorie,) as that it hath beene able not onely to encounter you, but further to overthrow the power, and force of all that your wit and learning hath beene able to produce. And what arrogancie is this in you to thinke to prevaile in this cause of yours wherein you see all your forces to be already spent, consumed, and overthrowen? Yea, wherein, your grand Captaine, and **Champion Bellarmine** lyeth vanquished by sundry Protestants of severall Nations that have answered and confuted him, and in him all other Papists? For, what doe you, or any other Papists bring, but out of his store? Yea, so farre have you beene from being able to confute this cause I defend, as that you have much rather confirmed it and in a manner confessed it. For, touching the *spirituall Supremacie*: You sufficiently shew it to be rightly and properly belonging unto Christ Iesus; when you say that the Pope hath it no otherwise, but as *Vicar, Deputie, or Atturney* unto him: But you are not able to shew any letter of Atturney or any warrant letters Patents or Commission from Christ, whereby the Bishop of Rome is authorised to be his Vicar, Deputie or Atturney, more then any other Bishop: and therefore must the Pope, as having no just clayme or tittle unto it relinquish resigne and yeeld up the *spirituall supremacie* to Christ Iesus, to whom it is thus confessed that it rightly & properly belongeth. And touching the other point, concerning Kings: you affirme, and graunt that unto them belongeth the Civill and Temporall supremacie, but not the *spirituall*, and what doe we say more then so? For, the *spirituall supremacie* you know we give neyther to King nor Pope, nor to any creature, but to Christ Iesus onely, the sole Head *spirituall King and Monarch* of his whole Church Militant, as well as Triumphant: So that it is no other but a Civill or Temporall supremacie that we give unto Kings over all persons, and in all causes, Ecclesiasticall, as well as Civill, within their Dominions: And therefore herein also, it is evident that you have no reason to dissent from us. Yea, when *S. Chrysostome* was objected against you, (where he saith thus: *The King compelleth, The Priest exhorteth, The King hath sensible weapons, The Priest*

hath spirituall weapons) you directly affirmed & confessed that the *The King with his sensible weapons of Imprisonment, Banishment, Pecuniary mulcts, Temporall death, and other penalties, should force, when other meanes faile, the rebellious Children of the Church, to performe the r dutie unto their Prince and Prelate* And why may he not then, by the same sensible weapons and temporall authoritie force or compell likewise the *Fathers of the Church, (namely the Bishops, Pastors, and Ecclesiasticall Ministers)* to their duties if they be exorbitant rebellious, or obstinate as well as the *Children of the Church* whom they teach? For, this is the fond distinction you make, betweene the *Fathers*, and the *Children*, as though rebellion, obstinacie, and wilfulnesse were a fault in the children, but none in the teachers; or as though if it be a fault, it were a fault punishable in the children onely; and that the *Fathers* in that case deserving as much, or rather more punishment then the children, should neverthelesse goe free, and be dispunishable. But againe, when I alledged that cleere testimonie of *S. Augustine contra Cresconium lb. 3 cap. 51.* you forced by the unrefutable evidence of that testimonie, did also at last, expressly confesse that *Kings may command in things belonging to Religion*, and when I further cited in my Reply many and sundry Lawes and Constitutions made by the three famous Christian Emperours, viz, *Constantine the Great, Iustinian, and Charlemaigne*, concerning Bishops and other Ecclesiasticall Ministers, and concerning also Ecclesiasticall causes; you neyther did nor could, nor can denie those Lawes & Constitutions to have been made by them. Now what are all these (and many moe which might be cited) but as good, as so many confessions upon the matter, of the lawfull authoritie of Kings over persons Ecclesiasticall, and in causes also Ecclesiasticall as well as Civill and Temporall. Seeing then this cause is thus confessed by you, and can never be avoyded by any thing that you have alledged, (for, your evasions, distinctions, reasons, questions demaunded, and whatsoever else you had to say be now all fully and sufficiently answered and removed in these *Three Bookes of mine,*) Why should you contest or contend any longer against it? Doe you not feare, or make you no conscience, to wrestle & strive against that which is so manifest
a truth

a truth, as that it is undeniable & invincible? Or have you yet any better new matter or better reasons and distinctions to utter, then you have formerly delivered? If you have not (as I presume you have not,) in vaine it is for you to thinke upon making of a *Surrejoinder*, or other Answer to this my *Surreplycation*. For if you write againe, and write eyther *Patergales*, *impertinences*, or idle stuffe, it will be ridiculous: or if it be the same matter formerly delivered, though in different words & phrases, it will be no better then *Tautologizing*: and to leave the matter, and to fall to wrangling, jangling, scolding, ravling, reviling, reproaching, were much worse, & indeed most odious and detestable. Your best course therefore will be (as I thinke) to be ruled by those friends of yours that advise you to write no more in this cause. You have hitherto, (as you see,) by your writings done your selfe, your credite, and your cause no good but much hurt, and indeede irreparable losse, and irrecoverable damage, if you bee sensible of it: persist not in that course: *Piscator ictus sapit*, your time, your wit, your learning, I would wish you to bestow better, then in defence of that *Antichrist*, and of the *whore of Babylon*, Papall Rome. For, can any mans time, wit, or learning be worse imployed? *There is away* (saith Salomon) *that seemeth right to a man but the issues thereof are the wayes of death*. Bee not therefore your selfe deceived any longer in opinion, nor cause others by any more of your writings or perswasions to walke this wrong though to you peradventure right-seeming way of Popery, to your owne aswell as to their perdition, if you and they forsake it not. For all be required to forsake that whore of *Babylon*, the false and adulterate Church of Rome, and that *Antichristian Beast*, that is the head, ruler, and supporter of her, as they love their owne safetie and salvation, and upon paine of everlasting death and damnation. It seemeth you have not yet well learned out of the Divine Scriptures who is that *whore of Babylon*, nor who is that *Antichrist*, or that *Beast*, that beareth and supporteth her. It is therefore good, you should study, and know these things better before you write any more. For the not knowing of these things aright, causeth you and all the rest of the Papists in the world to be so much, & so mightily mistaken

Prov. 14. 12.

Prov. 16. 25.

Rev. 17. 1 2.

3. 4. &c.

Rev. 18. 4.

Re. 14. 9 10.

2. Thes. 2. 3.

4 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.

10. 11. 12.

1. Cor. II 16

taken in these matters as they be. As concerning me, My purpose and intention at the first, was (as appeareth by the Epistle Dedicatory of my first Booke) but onely to shew to the pretended Catholickes of this kingdome, *matter sufficient* to satisfie them in these two maine & most important points (which were and are established by the Lawes & Statutes of the same kingdome) viz. *The Supremacie*, and the *Religion*: and because I have now in these *Three Bookes* of mine, (especially if you consider them, not apart, but all joyntly together) shewed *matter*, not onely *sufficient* but also *redundant* and more then sufficient, (as I conceive it,) to satisfie them in both those points: The truth being thus made manifest, and my purpose therewithall being fully accomplished, why should I contend any further, or write any more in them? *If any man lust to be contentious, we have no such custome* (saith S. Paul) *neither the Churches of God*. For my part I neither like, nor love to follow, the bad disposition or disquiet humor of such as will not rest satisfied with an evident truth when it once splendidly appeareth but will still needlessly strive, as if they meant to make their controversies and contentions endlesse. If you tell me, that those whom I call the pretended Catholickes, be not yet inwardly satisfied, converted, and reformed, I answer that I wish they were, and I am sorry they are not: But that inward satisfaction and conversion is Gods gift and not mans; all that men can doe in this case, is onely to use the outward and externall meanes & there is no more to be expected at their hands: Howbeit if after all this, you will still continue to be contentious, or if you or they rest not thus satisfied, but doe yet require further satisfaction in these points: Then for that I for my part doe thinke that I have spoken sufficiently in them already, and for that I have also other businesse, and another calling & profession to looke to: I must as here I doe from henceforth leave the further execution and handling of these matters, (as cause shall require,) to the Reverend, godly and learned *Protestant. professed Divines*, who know best how to give you and them the best satisfaction in cases of that kinde, and whom it best becommeth to intermeddle in them, and to whose care, calling, & profession they doe indeede chiefly and more specially appertaine. God,

(if

To a popish Adversary.

91

(if such be his will and pleasure,) illuminate the understandings, and so move and incline the hearts and affections of all the Papists of this kingdome, and of all the rest of the kingdomes and Nations of the World beside, that they may all be converted from *Pope* and *Popery*, unto his unfallible, victorious, and Triumphant *Word* and *Truth*: To the great glory of his Name: The everlasting salvation of their owne soules: The further and mighty enlargement of his Church: The confusion of *Antichrist* and of all Antichristian errors and heresies: and to the generall good of all Christendome, and consequently of the whole world: Through *I E S U S*
CHRIST our Lord.
Amen.

ESAI. LXII. 6. 7.

Yee that be the Lords remembrancers, keepe not silence, and give him no rest, till he repayre and untill he set up Ierusalem, the prayse of the World.

FINIS.



ERRATA sic Corrige.

P 13.6.l.2. *reade*, and taking the profits, p. 1. l. 19 *kinde*, kinde, p. 19 *neofe*
meales, peccemeals, p. 11. l. 31. *have*, had, p. 13. l. 3. *reade* I deale not now, &c.
p. 14. l. 28 *blot* this word well, l. 30 *yea*, But, p. 21. l. 12. *tum*, cum, p. 26. l. 26. *esper* all
especially, p. 17. l. 12 *firpo*, scirpo, p. 31. l. 5. *new*, meere, l. 38 *seive* God as they be
lings, &c. p. 22. l. 28. *divifing*, devising, p. 33. l. 24 *sacerdotis*, sacerdotij, p. 42. l. 19.
will, would, l. 30 *conservating*, consecrating p. 46. l. 2. *Iofuah*, Iofiah, l. 7 *accerded*
recorded, p. 47. l. 17 *which*, eleventh, p. 50. 37. *reade*, as a regent, or curator, or
like, &c. p. 53. l. 3. *an*, and, p. 54. l. 22. *blot* out, *selfe*, p. 59. l. 18 *rather*, other, p. 68. l.
27. *praesides*, praesedit, l. 31. *qua*, quæ, p. 73. l. 22. *reade*, to this one shee pefould, l.
23. *on* pastor, one pastor, p. 76. l. 11. *as*, omitted & *reade* it thus, as S. Bernard spea-
keth, p. 79. l. 19. *Emperors*, Emperor, l. 27. *mac*, man, p. 81. l. 8. & l. 14. *Monarchicall*,
Monarchicall, p. 85. l. 19. *a causa non, us causa*, a nō causa ut causa, l. 31. *in* conside-
ratively, inconsideratively, p. 11. l. 5. *more* then yet I know, more then I yet know
p. 3. l. 27. *fro*, for, p. 4. l. 23. *Catholickes*, Catholickes, p. 8. l. 24. *reade*, why is it not
printed, p. 28. l. 24. *may* com and, may command in, p. 41. l. 18. *reade* it thus: If you
take the word Priest, for him, p. 57. l. 28. *there*, their, p. 73. l. 32. *reade*, but of a
ready minde, p. 26. l. 20. *yet*, you, p. 17. l. 4. *note* in the margent Eph. 4. 13. p. 19. *in*
the margent where Ioh. 6. 36. 57. say 37. p. 22 *in* the usargent omit Esai. 6. 10 11. 12
p. 25 *in* marg. for prooffe of Liberius banishment, make it Theodor. libr. 2. c. 15. 16.
in marg p. 34. l. 26. put Rom. 13. 1 2 3. 4. 5. p. 36. l. 32. *our*, your, p. 43. l. 12 *in* marg.
write, 2. Sam. 6. 17. p. 71. l. 21. 1. Tim. 1. 6. put 1. Tim. 1. 7 p. 85. *these* wordes Reges
gentium, &c. omit in the margent as being needelesse, p. 38. l. 24. *speake*, spake, p. 13
l. 8. *reade* thus: But if you will yet still, p. 83. *in* the margent adde to Greg. libr. 4.
epist. 32. & p. 84. adde to Gregory in the margent, lib. 4. *epist.* 38 p. 38. l. 36. *reade*
thus: you for your part, (as I conceive) &c. And if there be any other faul-
tyes in the Printing, or pointing, I desire the Reader to correct them with his pen.

